Some Anons have recently expressed interest in having more “book club” threads, specifically works written by people within the higher levels of the global power structure. I’ve decided to contribute. Today, I want to discuss a book titled “The Impact of Science on Society” by Bertrand Russell. Keep in mind, this is going to be an info dump and analysis thread with an abundance of text and contextual historical information. If that isn’t your thing then this thread isn’t really for you.

However, before analyzing and critiquing the text itself, we must first examine the background and history of its author, Bertrand Russell, as well as the aristocratic family to which he belonged.

Bertrand Russell was a famed philosopher, logician, and mathematician. He was the son of John Russell, Viscount Amberley, and his wife Katharine Louisa Russell, Viscountess Amberley. His father was a Member of Parliament for Nottingham from May 11, 1866 to November 11, 1868. His mother was a British suffragist and an early advocate of birth control in the United Kingdom.

His paternal grandfather, John Russell, was a two-time Prime Minister of the United Kingdom; first, from June 30, 1846 to February 21, 1852 and then again from October 29, 1865 to June 26, 1866. The Russell family is an aristocratic dynasty that has held prominent political offices uninterrupted since the 1500s. Several of the Russell descendants were knighted in the Most Noble Order of the Garter and were appointed to His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

Katharine Russell was the daughter of Edward John Stanley, 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderley, and Henrietta Maria Stanley, Baroness Stanley of Alderley. As a result of this union, she was born into the aristocratic Audley-Stanley bloodline. The family’s prominence as landowners dates as far back as 1080 A.D., with their appearance in William the Conqueror’s Domesday survey. Similar to the Russell family, numerous Stanley descendants were knighted in the Most Noble Order of the Garter and appointed to His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council. For generations, the family held the Peerage titles of both Baron Audley and Baron Stanley. The family currently maintains the title of Earl of Derby. The Stanleys have also been a prominent political family for centuries, with many of their members belonging to the Conservative Party.

Bertrand Russell was initiated into several of Britain’s most influential institutions of the age. According to Nuffield College Library records, Bertrand Russell first joined the Fabian Society in 1897 at the notably young age of twenty-five years old. Russell was also briefly employed as a professor of German social democracy at the Fabian created London School of Economics. A few years later in 1902, the Fabian Socialist leaders Sidney and Beatrice Webb invited Russell to join their Coefficients Dining Club. Russell was then elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1908.

In 1920, Russell visited China to teach at Peking University during the height of the anti-imperialist New Culture Movement. He immediately received recognition from statesmen, political ideologues, and journalists alike. While in Changsha, China, Bertrand Russell gave a series of four lectures on “Bolshevism and World Government” to an audience of educators and political representatives from each county in Hunan. The future Chairman of the Communist Party of China, Mao Zedong, was there in attendance.

Although Russell supported the communist theory, he cautioned in favor of a Fabian incrementalist approach for the time being. Echoing Marxist dogma, he warned that communism requires industrialized society to take root, and the largely agrarian China was not yet ready for this step. For this reason, Russell criticized the Bolshevist approach for Chinese society. Instead, Russell promoted Chinese education, nationalism, and democracy as ideological stepping stones towards communist revolution. The leading Chinese newspapers reported on his lectures, giving his propaganda a major platform to spread.

In May 1920, Bertrand Russell and a British delegation were invited to Soviet Russia to study the progress of the new regime in the midst of the Russian Civil War. I’ve already posted an analysis on H.G. Wells' book “Russia in the Shadows”, in which Wells describes his own visit to Soviet Russia. H.G. Wells, like Bertrand Russell, had been a member of the Fabian Society. I emphasize this point to draw attention to the connections between the Bolsheviks and the Fabian Socialists.

The Fabian Society was established in 1884 in London, England. The Fabian Socialists were rabid advocates of world government and depopulation similar to Communists like Leon Trotsky. However, in contrast to the Bolshevik model of violent revolution to achieve Communist and collectivist government, they promoted the “Fabian Strategy” consisting of incrementally infiltrating and subverting western governmental systems through the democratic process.

Additionally, they focused on directing and influencing the British labor unions and movements. They also subverted western cultural institutions, practices, and traditions as a means to that end. Hence, the Fabian Society recruited many prominent authors, playwrights, philosophers, and cultural figures such as: H.G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, and Bertrand Russell. The Fabians understood the propagandic value of fiction and literature in promoting global collectivism to the public.

They routinely promoted various social movements and causes ranging from women’s suffrage, birth control, eugenics (depopulation), new age spirituality, sexual promiscuity, homosexuality, transgenderism, psychedelic drug use, and feigned anti-war pacifism. The Fabians saw religion and

nationalism as the biggest obstacles to the establishment of a one world government, the implementation of a collectivized world economy, and the widespread adoption of depopulation policies. The Fabian Society's leadership also created the British Labour Party.

The Royal Society is an English scientific academy that was founded on November 28, 1660. The society was given a royal charter by King Charles II, and the reigning British monarch has continued to serve as the "invisible college's" official patron ever since. Several of the organization's founders such as Christopher Wren and Robert Moray allegedly went on to establish the foundations of modern freemasonry. The society remains the oldest and arguably the most influential continuously existing scientific institution in the world.

Before beginning this analysis, I want to address one key point. Globalist thinkers often protect themselves with a shield of plausible deniability within their writings. They claim to be merely observing or hypothesizing on the direction of future trends rather than actively conspiring to help bring them about. However, when we consider the history of these individuals, their actions, their familial lineages, and the organizational networks to which they belong, it becomes clear that they aren't merely the impartial observers of history which they portray themselves to be.

These writers often masquerade as compassionate humanitarians who desire nothing more than the utmost welfare of their fellow man. While their narratives generally contain many valuable truths, they always infuse an abundance of propaganda and outright falsities inside their publications. Still, there are rare moments when the mask slips entirely, and they deliberately expose their true sinister intentions. As it would have it, there are a few examples of these types of admissions in this book.

Therefore, it is essential to learn to read between the lines when analyzing the content of these texts. We can't always take these authors at their word. Instead, we must critically examine and interpret the content of their material in order to decipher its true meaning. Additionally, I will compare Bertrand Russell's book with the works of other globalist authors to see if we can corroborate any common patterns or themes.

Now, let us delve into the text itself. The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell was supposedly first published in 1942 by Blackie & Son Limited in Bombay, India. However, I've also seen claims that George Allen & Unwin originally published the work in London in 1952. The information on the publishing page differs significantly based on the particular edition.

As its title suggests, the book's main theme focuses on how advancements in scientific techniques, technologies, and ideologies have fundamentally altered the social order of mankind. Russell briefly summarizes the history of scientific movements and their respective revolutions. He scrutinizes how governments and other powerful institutions utilize these new scientific advancements to enhance their own authority. He prognosticates the emergence of a technocratic, scientific dictatorship dominated by a selected class of intelligentsia and oligarchic elites. As a member of the scientific aristocracy, Bertrand Russell provides an invaluable blueprint for understanding the machinations, strategies, and long-term ambitions of the technocratic establishment.

Bertrand Russell argues that the emergence of Darwinism has fundamentally challenged the philosophical and spiritual underpinnings of our religious theologies. Adherents of the theory of evolution object to the biblical story of creation within the Book of Genesis. If Homo sapiens' ancestors lived hundreds of thousands of years ago, wouldn't this dispute the creationist account which implies the earth's lifespan at around 6,000 years old? Did primitive and animalistic hominoids have souls? Were they capable of sin and morality? Did they go to heaven or hell? These are the problematic questions that Russell posits for the Christian faith:

"Darwinism has had many effects upon man's outlook on life and the world, in addition to the extrusion of purpose of which I have already spoken. The absence of any sharp line between men and apes is very awkward for theology. When did men get souls? Was the Missing Link capable of sin and therefore worthy of hell? Did Pithecanthropus Erectus have moral responsibility? Was Homo Pekiniensis damned? Did Piltdown Man go to heaven? Any answer must be arbitrary."

As we will examine later, Bertrand Russell and his fellow Fabians were radically opposed to religious faith. They viewed religious values as a major roadblock to Scientism, globalism, and technocratic feudalism. Julian Huxley later echoed this sentiment in his book UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy, "Unesco must see that its activities and ideas are not opposed to this body of established scientific doctrine, just as it must encourage the use of the scientific method wherever it is applicable. Thus it cannot and must not tolerate the blocking of research or the hampering of its application by superstition or theological prejudice. It must disregard or, if necessary, oppose unscientific or anti-scientific movements, such as anti-vivisectionism, fundamentalism, belief in miracles, crude spiritualism, etc". Scientism and Darwinism were the highest doctrines which superseded all other moral or philosophical creeds.

According to Russell, Darwinism threatened more than just religious and theological creeds. It impugns the values of eighteenth-century liberalism, "But Darwinism—especially when crudely misinterpreted — threatened not only theological orthodoxy but also the creed of eighteenth-century liberalism". This political school espouses that all men are created equal, and as such are endowed with certain natural, inalienable rights.

However, Russell points out that, from a biological perspective, men are undoubtedly not created equal. He expounds that man's intelligence is derived exclusively from heredity, and education plays but one small role in his intellectual development. This discredited the views of liberal philosophers who attributed a man's abilities exclusively to his rigorous scholarship rather than to his inherent nature.

For Russell, this inherent contradiction between political equality and biological inequality jeopardizes the logical foundation of eighteenth century-liberalism. Bertrand Russell implies that if the public realizes liberal philosophy advances civil rights strictly for political purposes, rather than such equality having a basis in fact, then they might reject the entire doctrine outright, "If men are to be conventionally equal politically, it must be not because they are really equal biologically, but for some more specifically political reason. Such reflections have endangered political liberalism, though not, to my mind, justly". Here we see Russell masquerading as a compassionate liberal who cares deeply for the public's welfare and their civil equality. However, throughout this analysis, Russell's sinister nature will become increasingly revealed.

Accordingly, Russell contends that civil, natural, or constitutional rights should never be absolute. He believes that "social welfare" should supersede individual liberty whenever the two come in conflict, "As Bentham said: "Rights of man, nonsense; imprescriptible rights of man, nonsense on stilts." We must admit that there are gains to the community so great that for their sake it becomes right to inflict an injustice on an individual… In general, the "Rights of Man" must be subject to the supreme consideration of the general welfare". Russell gives the classic example of a conquering army demanding hostages from a defeated enemy while threatening to annihilate its entire citizenry should it refuse. He argues that civil officials have an obligation to surrender these hostages to protect the body politic. I've noticed a recurring pattern where collectivist ideologues invoke the most extreme examples to justify the debasement and abolition of our human rights.

Russell ends this paragraph with a very telling admission. He acknowledges that if society were to accept the principle of conditional rights, its rulers would inevitably enlarge these boundaries to their furthest possible extent. Tyrannical oligarchs will always favor governmental interests over individual liberties during any such dispute, "The doctrine is important because the holders of power, especially in an oligarchy, will be much too prone, on each occasion, to think that this is one of those cases in which the doctrine should be ignored". Of course, any student of history knows that small concessions of individual freedom create legal precedents for future governmental abuse. Despite Russell's masquerade as a compassionate liberal, this passage reveals his true Fabian worldview where the individual must acquiesce to technocratic control.

In a previous thread, I analyzed Julian Huxley's book UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy. Within the text, Huxley endorsed and promoted the concept of moral relativism. This is the philosophical belief that there are no universal or absolute moral principles. Essentially, nothing is objectively morally right or wrong; instead, morality is entirely subjective, based solely on the inclinations of a particular culture or period.

Bertrand Russell cites the American philosopher and educational reformer John Dewey, who perverts and expands this fallacy to an even greater extreme. As a founder of the Pragmatism philosophical tradition, Dewey is not concerned with the nature of reality and truth. Instead, Dewey promotes the pragmatist philosophical concept eventually known as factual relativism. This is the belief that even the truth itself is relative and subjective. Instead of searching for truth, Dewey is concerned with the mere utility of various creeds, ideologies, and worldviews, "This philosophy has two aspects, one theoretical and the other ethical. On the theoretical side, it analyzes away the concept "truth," for which it substitutes "utility."" This is significant since the scientific establishment derives much of its philosophy from the pragmatist school of thought.

Russell demonstrates how this factual relativist concept can also be used to subvert the historical narrative and divorce it from the chronicled record. He states that historical truth no longer matters. What does matter is if the current historical narrative, whether true or false, is useful to the ruling class, "It used to be thought that, if you believed Caesar crossed the Rubicon, you believed truly, because Caesar did cross the Rubicon. Not so, say the philosophers we are considering: to say that your belief is "true" is another way of saying that you will find it more profitable than the opposite belief". This demonstrates how the scientific aristocracy has no compunction towards lying about historical truth or even the very nature of reality itself.

Furthermore, Russell reveals how elites utilize factual relativism not just to falsify ancient history but even to distort more recent events. Russell references how Leon Trotsky was viewed as a hero of the Russian Revolution in 1920. However, after Joseph Stalin came to power, his Soviet regime erased Trotsky's involvement from the public consciousness entirely, "But this kind of objection is swept aside by the contention that a belief may be "true" at one time and "false" at another. In 1920 it was "true" that Trotsky had a great part in the Russian Revolution; in 1930 it was "false." The results of this view have been admirably worked out in George Orwell's ''1984."" Russell mentions George Orwell's famous book 1984, where truth changes daily based on the current party narrative. When taken to its logical conclusion, the Pragmatist philosophy enables governments to change reality however they see fit.

According to Bertrand Russell, the pragmatist philosophy is fundamentally based on the pursuit of power. The scientific aristocracy does not seek knowledge for its own sake. Rather, they attain

knowledge for the functional power that its discoveries provide, “And if power is all you want from science, the pragmatist theory gives you just what you want, without accretions that to you seem irrelevant”. From the elite’s perspective, power is not a means to any particular end but rather an end entirely to itself. They desire the power to rule over others, not to assist or guide them.

The Darwinist and Pragmatist schools also coincide with the Humanist philosophical tradition. Humanist philosophy considers man as the foundation of all moral and philosophical inquiry. Similar to Darwinism and Pragmatism, Humanism is a largely atheistic and secular based philosophy. Since God no longer exists under this philosophical framework, humanity must now transcend its own mortality and achieve a “true” state of divinity. In short, the elite see themselves as gods with the power and authority to do as they will. And what greater power is there than the power over life and death itself? Or the power to dictate metaphysical “truth” at one's whims?

“It gives you even more than you could have expected, for if you control the police it gives you the godlike power of making truth. You cannot make the sun cold, but you can confer pragmatic 'truth" on the proposition "the sun is cold" if you can ensure that everyone who denies it is liquidated. I doubt whether Zeus could do more.”

Bertrand Russell highlights the development of nineteenth century telecommunications technology as a major scientific turning point; one which had a revolutionary impact on the course of history and fundamentally altered human behavior. In particular, he considers the invention of the telegraph and the telephone of paramount importance. Law enforcement officials are among the chief beneficiaries of telecommunications technology. Prior to the industrial revolution, criminals and fugitives could elude their pursuers by going on the run from city to city. Through telecommunications, distant police departments can now share information and coordinate operations to apprehend their quarries:

“The fact that messages could travel faster than human beings was useful, above all, to the police. Before the telegraph, a highwayman on a galloping horse could escape to a place where his crime had not yet been heard of, and this made it very much harder to catch him”.

As such, Russell notes that both the telegraph and the telephone have led to corresponding reductions in criminal activity. He also lists other scientific advancements that have improved public safety, such as street lights and finger-printing technology, “Street lighting, telephones, finger-printing, and the psychology of crime and punishment are scientific advances which have made it possible for the police to reduce crime below anything that the most Utopian philosopher of the "Age of Reason" would have imagined possible”. Understanding criminal psychology and designing punishments accordingly has also curtailed lawless and unruly behavior in society. Russell emphasizes how improvements in public safety would not have been possible without these scientific inventions.

However, Bertrand Russell acknowledges that while society has benefitted from telecommunications, these scientific inventions have also been a double-edged sword. While governments can utilize this new communication power to apprehend dangerous criminals, they can also use it to persecute political dissidents and even innocent bystanders. In the hands of tyrants, these technologies become powerful weapons from which few can escape, “Unfortunately, however, the men whom the police wish to catch are frequently benefactors of mankind… A large proportion of the best Germans and Russians have suffered under Hitler and Stalin; many more would have escaped but for the rapid transmission of messages. The increased power of the police therefore, is not wholly a gain”. On this point, Russell specifically refers to national leaders abusing their country’s communication systems to round up their domestic enemies. However, this threat takes on an entirely new gravity in the context of a globalized system. Refugees can potentially escape from tyrannical countries simply by crossing national borders. However, if a totalitarian world government ever comes to power, there will be nowhere left for us to run or hide.

Russell contemplates that telecommunications provide governments with an unprecedented degree of central control and stability. Throughout the history of ancient warfare, governors and generals would rebel against their own monarchs in bids for individual power. Hampered by the limitations of horseback and ship travel, it could take messengers weeks or even months before informing their central governments of these new emerging threats. This slow response gave these would-be usurpers the precious time they needed for military mobilization. However, thanks to the advent of telecommunications, governments can now respond instantaneously and unilaterally to the latest crises. As Russell describes in the following passage:

“Increase of central control is an even more important consequence of the telegraph. In ancient empires satraps or proconsuls in distant provinces could rebel, and had time to entrench themselves before the central government knew of their disaffection. When Constantine proclaimed himself Emperor at York and marched on Rome, he was almost under the walls of the city before the Roman authorities knew he was coming. Perhaps if the telegraph had existed in those days the Western world would not now be Christian. In the War of 1812, the battle of New Orleans was fought after peace had been concluded, but neither army was aware of the fact. Before the telegraph, ambassadors had an independence which they have now completely lost, because they had to be allowed a free hand if swift action was necessary in a crisis.”

Russell mentions how people tremble at the heinousness and depravity of Roman Emperors like Caligula and Nero, but their crimes pale in comparison to those of modern tyrants. This is not because current despots are more heinous or cruel than their predecessors but rather that they simply have more scientific tools at their disposal.

He points out that ancient tyrants like Nero often created spy networks to root out potential enemies, but they were still themselves vulnerable of falling victim to conspiracy. In contrast, scientific and technological advancements in information gathering provide modern tyrants with an unprecedented degree of security and stability, “Nero did his best to establish a spy system which would smell out traitors, but a conspiracy defeated him in the end. If he had been defended by the N.K.V.D. he might have died in his bed at a ripe old age. These are a few of the blessings that science has bestowed on tyrants”. Russell also mentions how scientific improvements in industrialized warfare and systematic slaughter enable tyrants to more efficiently dispose of troublemakers.

Additionally, conspiracies are less likely to occur from within these intelligence agencies themselves since spies are constantly monitoring each other for any signs of disloyalty. The Praetorian Guard regularly overthrew their own emperors. Few in the NKVD would even dare to try.

The suppression of the mass surveillance state also trickles down to the commoners as well. In the past, political persecutions were largely confined to infighting amongst the ruling class. However, thanks to modern advancements in communications and surveillance, anybody and everybody is now a possible target. Tyrants can now monitor both the mob and the court, thus rooting out any potential threats.

Russell describes how totalitarian governments instill a culture of surveillance, where the public spies on each other on behalf of the state. Government schools train a generation of students to spy on their parents, watching for any sign of dissident behavior against the ruling regime. Neighbors become government informants against their friends and family, “Children at school are taught that it is their duty to denounce their parents if they allow themselves subversive utterances in the bosom of the family. No one can be sure that a man who seems to be his dearest friend will not denounce him to the police; the man may himself have been in some trouble, and may know that if he is not efficient as a spy his wife and children will suffer. All this is not imaginary; it is daily and hourly reality. Nor, given oligarchy, is there the slightest reason to expect anything else”. Since nobody knows who they can trust, nobody dares to speak out publicly. Russell often invokes the Soviet Union as a model for the ideal scientific surveillance state. Still, he points out that the methods totalitarian governments employ depend on the scientific techniques and technologies that are available to them.

Russell specifies other strategies that scientific regimes use to standardize public opinion. Totalitarian regimes frequently employ the media and the arts as weapons of cultural warfare. Since communistic systems nationalize all theatres and broadcasting stations, the state exclusively monopolizes their propagandic effect. If the regime nationalizes printing offices, then the state maintains a complete monopoly on paper. Commoners are reduced to discreetly spreading their dissident messages by word of mouth. But since nobody trusts each other in a surveillance society, few men are brave enough to take

such risks, “Printing is impossible without paper, and all paper belongs to the State. Broadcasting and the cinema are equally public monopolies. The only remaining possibility of unauthorized propaganda is by secret whispers from one individual to another”. These methods create an atomized, self-policing culture where people quickly learn to censor their own thoughts and words. If they refuse to submit, they are summarily punished to serve as chilling examples for their fellow countrymen.

As a former educator, Russell notes how compulsory schooling empowers the state with a complete monopoly over prepubescent education; this monopoly continues from adolescence all the way up to young adulthood. Teachers completely mold the minds of their students, brainwashing them into believing the state approved narrative, “The completeness of the resulting control over opinion depends in various ways upon scientific technique. Where all children go to school, and all schools are controlled by the government, the authorities can close the minds of the young to everything contrary to official orthodoxy”. Since governments hold a near monopoly on public education, they can effectively censor or prohibit any dissident perspectives. After all, the state will never willingly teach their students to question the doctrines of their teachers.

Bertrand Russell cites the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte who professed that educational indoctrinators should primarily aspire to destroy their students’ capacity for self-determination. For the rest of their lives, these brainwashed graduates will be unable to think or act outside their psychological constraints, “Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils have left school, they shall be incapable, throughout the rest of their lives, of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished”. While this was an impossible goal during Fichte’s lifetime, Russell contends that Marxist communism has gone a long way towards achieving it.

Russell emphasizes that the science of educational indoctrination must be solely restricted to the ruling class. It is imperative that the general public never learns how their opinions and behaviors are shaped, “Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated”. The power of the ruling class depends on their scientific, technological, and psychological superiority over the general public. The rulers must carefully conceal and safeguard this knowledge away from those they rule or risk their own deposition.

Russell contends that when the science of educational indoctrination becomes fully perfected, governments will be able to control their citizenry without military or police enforcement. He asserts that only one country has achieved this level of educational control, “When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country

which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise". While Russell does not elaborate on which country he is alluding to, I think he's most likely referencing the Soviet educational system. Although, it's also possible he's suggesting the Prussian-inspired American schooling system instead.

Bertrand Russell briefly outlines the process and principles of educational indoctrination. He recounts the Greek philosopher Anaxagoras who claimed that, despite its white appearance, snow was actually black in color. Russell believes that future social psychologists will test new methods of educational indoctrination to convince their students that snow is in fact black, "But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark gray". Russell envisions a world in which the educational controllers could calculate the required resources necessary to manipulate public consciousness, all the way down to the individual level.

Scientific advancements in mass psychology have clinically revolutionized the art of persuasion. Appealing to Bernaysian principles of social engineering, Russell recognizes the tremendous propagandic potency of emotional manipulation. It is through man's instinctual passions, not his analytical reason, that his ideological paradigm is primarily derived. By weaponizing man's own sentiments against him, scientific indoctrinators subtly steer him towards a predetermined conclusion. Russell dreams of a dystopic future where our personal opinions are entirely shaped by a technocratic elite:

"What is essential in mass psychology is the art of persuasion. If you compare a speech of Hitler's with a speech of (say) Edmund Burke, you will see what strides have been made in the art since the eighteenth century. What went wrong formerly was that people had read in books that man is a rational animal, and framed their arguments on this hypothesis. We now know that limelight and a brass band do more to persuade than can be done by the most elegant train of syllogisms. It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment."

Russell fears the effects of educational indoctrination might be counteracted by parental and familial guidance. For this reason, Russell views these influences as a pressing threat to the technocratic agenda, "First, that the influence of home is obstructive". While parents raise their children into moral and independent individuals, governments only want obedient and impotent automatons. Therefore, educational systems devise various strategies to neutralize domestic influence. Children are trained to view their parents as old-fashioned at best and morally backwards at worst. The elites have often used generational antagonism as a divide-and-conquer strategy.

Russell understands that educational indoctrination must start early in one's youth in order to ensure its ultimate effectiveness. In his estimation, students must begin their schooling at no later than ten years of

age or their subsequent indoctrination might not take hold, “Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten”. As the Jesuit founder Saint Ignatius of Loyola allegedly once said, ‘Give me a child till he is seven years old, and I will show you the man’. Of course, the younger the indoctrination starts, the more effective it eventually becomes.

According to Russell, music can evoke a powerful propagandic effect useful for social engineering. By combining intoned melodies with verbal disinformation, educators can override their students’ logical faculties and directly manipulate their emotional sensibilities, “Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective”. Julian Huxley substantiated this claim in his document titled “UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy”. As Huxley expounded, “Music makes the most direct approach to the emotions, without the intervention of any barrier of language other than its own”. It’s critical to recognize that social engineers manipulate their targets by appealing to their emotions rather than their reason. And as the Athenian philosopher Plato described over two millennia ago, music penetrates the innermost soul and takes the strongest hold upon it.

While describing the future economy of the world state, Bertrand Russell candidly promotes the Fabian Socialist model. He advocates for a synthesis between the Bolshevik communist system and its western capitalist counterpart. This new system would combine the top-down centralization of communism with the ruthless efficiency of modern corporatism. As fellow Fabian Socialist H.G. Wells describes in his book “Russia in the Shadows”, both the capitalist and communist systems invariably consolidate into the same hybridized structure, “Big business is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses to Collectivism”. Thus, it’s more accurate to view these economic systems as converging experiments, designed to ascertain the most efficient methods for behavioral control.

Bertrand Russell endorses many Marxist policies that typify a command economy. Russell believes that the state should implement fixed price controls over all economic goods and services. According to Russell, the world government should nationalize all natural resources and raw materials in the globalized economy. Furthermore, the regime should control the quantity of industrial production in every business, “The foreign relations of an industry are access to raw material, quantity and price of finished product. These it should not control”. On the other hand, private businessmen would maintain full control over other aspects of industrial production and daily administration. These industrialists would be granted a degree of autonomy and encouraged to develop technical innovations to lower costs and increase output.

Russell exploits the cause of environmental conservation as further justification for resource nationalization. According to Russell, the efficiency of scientific progress cannot keep pace with current

rates of resource depletion. In fact, he “believes” that industrial society requires continuous scientific advancements merely to maintain our current prosperity, yet alone to improve upon it. Russell argues that only an international governmental authority can effectively conserve and ration our natural resources, “If raw materials are not to be used up too fast, there must not be free competition for their acquisition and use but an international authority to ration them in such quantities as may from time to time seem compatible with continued industrial prosperity”. Today, we see organizations like the Club of Rome and the World Wide Fund for Nature promote similar policies under the guise of environmentalism.

Additionally, Russell broadens this concept to the cause of soil conservation. He panics his readers by stating that our current wasteful utilization of soil combined with an ever-increasing population will result in continuous food shortages, “If there is not to be a permanent and increasing shortage of food, agriculture must be conducted by methods which are not wasteful of soil, and increase of population must not outrun the increase in food production rendered possible by technical improvements…The population of the world is increasing, and its capacity for food production is diminishing. Such a state of affairs obviously cannot continue very long without producing a cataclysm”. He promotes agricultural collectivization as the sole solution for maintaining soil fertility and preserving food security.

However, Russell advocates for the world state and private corporations to eventually merge into public-private partnerships. He believes that certain government functions should be allocated to these corporations and trade unions so long as they operate under the auspices and direction of the world state, “Now, especially in a small country like ours, there would be no difficulty in allocating certain governmental functions to bodies like the trade unions, which classify people by their occupation, not by their habitation”. Today, we see this same sentiment echoed by the descendants of these conspirators, such as Klaus Schwab and Anne-Marie Slaughter, who continuously promote public and private integration. The elites salivate at the idea of destroying traditional barriers that confine the scope of corporate and governmental power respectively.

While Russell pays lip service in this book regarding the value of private property, in his other written works he more candidly reveals his true opinion. In his book titled “Proposed Roads to Freedom. Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism”, he bluntly admits his desire to abolish private property ownership. He states, “On the contrary, I believe that the abolition of private ownership of land and capital is a necessary step toward any world in which the nations are to live at peace with one another”. Of course, as we already know, this prohibition of property ownership will only apply to the common public. The elite themselves will still be permitted private property as a reward for their “service” to the world state.

However, contrary to naïve rank-and-file leftists, Russell actually champions the pursuit of profit rather than condemning it. Despite popular misconceptions, Russell and his Fabian Socialist colleagues understand that there is no inherent contradiction between socialism and corporatism. Industrialists would be financially compensated for their managerial role and allowed to accumulate significant wealth:

“My own belief is that a collective profit motive can be, and should be, combined with socialism… The profit motive, in a new form, would survive, but without the old evils. By devolution, the motive could be made to operate on each mine”.

Russell briefly speaks on the propagandic influence of political terminology and labels. He astutely recognizes that the public often supports a particular political ideology while opposing its purported antithesis regardless of the inherent identicalities between these two systems. They will endorse their domestic system while impugning a foreign one that is, for all intents and purposes, indistinguishable from their own. They endorse political platforms and candidates without comprehending the contents or merits of their policies, “For some reason which I have failed to understand, many people like the system when it is Russian but disliked the very same system when it was German. I am compelled to think that this is due to the power of labels; these people like whatever is labeled "Left" without examining whether the label has any justification”. Since most people possess a very surface-level understanding of political programs, they are easily manipulated through basic propagandic slogans and labels. They fail to recognize when political legislation counteracts the very values that they claim to uphold. In this way, Russell demonstrates the ideological identicality between German fascism and Russian communism. Both systems are structural predecessors to our modern Fabian Socialist, globalist technocracy.

Bertrand Russell highlights another extremely important, yet fully intended, consequence of economic globalization; this being the concept of interdependence. Russell details how peasants in underdeveloped countries maintain a higher degree of autonomy compared to their industrialized counterparts. They often survive on near subsistence-level farming, relying only on the cheap equipment required to cultivate their crops. As a result, the political and economic turbulence of the outside world has little impact on their daily lives. Of course, this freedom and self-sufficiency comes at the cost of poverty and food insecurity. During times of famine, these peasants suffer greatly and are vulnerable to starvation.

On the other hand, Russell notes that farmers living in modern, industrialized countries are highly subject to currents of economic and political forces. As he describes, “There may still be nominally independent farmers, but in fact they are in the power of the vast financial interests that are concerned in manipulating political issues”. These farmers financially depend on exporting their products to foreign markets. However, when political or economic turmoil disrupts foreign trade, entire industries are

crippled overnight. This can be brought about by currency fluctuations, economic sanctions, foreign aid, reductions of farm subsidies, shifting political alliances, or any number of factors.

Russell clarifies that this phenomenon of economic interdependence is just as prevalent within socialist nations as it is in capitalist ones. Russell cites Thomas Malthus' "derision" that free trade policies could eventually lead to countries exclusively specializing in niche industries while completely neglecting the production of essential goods. It was once considered outlandish that countries would import the bulk of their food supply from foreign nations, but that is quickly becoming an increasing reality:

"This interdependence is in no degree lessened—perhaps it is even increased—if the countries concerned are socialist, as, for example, if the Soviet Government and the British Government make a deal to exchange food for machinery. All this is the effect of scientific technique in agriculture. Malthus, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, wrote: "In the wildness of speculation it has been suggested (of course more in jest than in earnest) that Europe should grow its corn in America, and devote itself solely to manufactures and commerce." It turned out that the speculation was by no means "wild.""

The effects of interdependence are not restricted to individual citizens or even entire industries. They apply to entire nations, and by extension, to humanity as a whole. Since countries can no longer produce the goods and services required for individual survival, they depend upon cheap foreign imports within a globalized free trade system. Thus, if any nation dares to promote their national interests above those of their contemporaries and violates international mandates, the world community can impose economic sanctions until the offender acquiesces into compliance. As Bertrand Russell describes, "Men will have to submit to the law, even when they think the law unjust and iniquitous. Nations which are persuaded that they are only demanding the barest justice will have to acquiesce when this demand is denied them by the neutral authority". The world state will never again permit any region to become truly self-sufficient. This is what the elites really mean when they describe the emerging multi-polar world order.

Bertrand Russell briefly examines how scientific societies invariably rely on the use of slavery. Russell points to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' gulag system which enslaved anywhere between eight to sixteen percent of its adult male population. The scientific ruling class favors forced labor not only for the direct economic benefits but also to depreciate the wages of so-called "free" workers, "Inevitably, forced labor, because it is economical, is favorably viewed by the authorities, and tends, by its competition, to depress the condition of "free" laborers". This, in turn, weakens the financial strength of the working class and increases their dependence on governmental support. Such weakened people are far less willing, or even capable, of resisting against their oppressive regime.

According to Russell, scientific societies inevitably enslave the bulk of their own populace. Russell hypothesizes that if these systems are not dismantled and allowed to continue unabated, they will

eventually encompass virtually every member of society. That is with the notable exceptions of law enforcement, armed forces, and government officials, “In the nature of things, unless the system is swept away, it must grow until no one is outside it except the army, the police, and government officials”. Scientific societies rely on their enforcers to uphold their tyrannical policies and, as such, they are granted special privileges unavailable to the rest of the public.

However, it’s worth mentioning that in modern scientific societies, the elites rarely require direct chattel slavery. As Charles Galton Darwin described in his book “The Next Million Years”, the bulk of humanity has always lived under some form of slavery regardless of its name, “and it is to be feared that all too often a fraction of humanity will have to live in a state which, whatever it may be called, will be indistinguishable from slavery”. Economic debt-based slavery has largely replaced the now archaic chattel slavery model. However, this is not its final form. The globalist scientific elites are currently implementing a new, more sophisticated form of slavery through social credit scores, central bank digital currencies, and austerity rationing.

Bertrand Russell briefly discusses pharmacological and dietary methods of social control. While Russell emphasizes the tremendous coercive influence of psychological techniques, he also recognizes the value of more direct forms of biochemical manipulation, “It is to be expected that advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have even in totalitarian countries”. The elites are not satisfied with manipulating the human mind through scientific propaganda. They want to fundamentally alter the biochemical process of the brain itself, preventing the very possibility of free and independent thought.

Russell prophesizes how scientific dictatorships might administer vaccines to both stupefy and pacify their domestic populations. Additionally, certain dietary restrictions could foster similar placating effects on human behavior, “Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so”. Although he doesn’t elaborate, I believe Russell is referring to the effects of GMO foods, insect and plant-based diets, and a total prohibition of meat consumption. Russell maintains that such processes must begin very early in a person’s childhood to fully maximize their detrimental effects.

I find this passage eerily similar to the World Economic Forum’s famous slogan, “You’ll own nothing and you’ll be happy”. Perhaps we are already being biochemically engineered to accept policies not in our best interests.

During his famous speech at the University of California's Berkeley campus in 1962, Aldous Huxley emphasized numerous applications of more direct forms of physiological control. Huxley corroborated how tyrants often distribute drugs to sedate and pacify the common rabble. With the right mixture of intoxicants, calmatives, and hallucinogens, the elite could tranquilize their workers into a state of utter contentment. This could be achieved despite the public living in the most appalling economic and social conditions, "In the hands of a dictator these substances in one kind or the other could be used with, first of all, complete harmlessness, and the result would be, you can imagine a euphoric that would make people thoroughly happy even in the most abominable circumstances". In his book Brave New World, Huxley wrote about a "fictional" society in which an elite constantly narcotized their underlings to prevent them from realizing the inhumanity of their conditions. Does life imitate art or does art imitate life? In this case, I think it's clearly the latter.

Bertrand Russell pays particular attention to the field of genetic engineering and examines how tyrants should utilize this technology in a scientific society. While Russell often uses the Soviet Union as an example of an efficient totalitarian society, he claims Nazi Germany was more scientific than the Soviets and therefore a better model for the future world state. He posits that if the Nazi regime had survived, they would have quickly adopted scientific breeding and genetic engineering policies, "If they had survived, they would probably have soon taken to scientific breeding. Any nation which adopts this practice will, within a generation, secure great military advantages". He rightly points out that any nation which adopts genetic engineering will gain a significant military advantage over their national competitors. This ironically compels unsuspecting nationalists to support genetic engineering regardless if this scientific power is concentrated in the hands of globalists.

However, while the elite could theoretically use genetic engineering to enhance human qualities, they could just as easily use it to retard them. The general public has several fundamental misconceptions regarding the true purpose of eugenical programs. The science of eugenics wasn't designed to improve the overall genetic stock and qualities of the human population. This eugenical aspect was exclusively reserved for the elites themselves. They believed in improving their progeny through carefully selected breeding practices with other elite families. They weren't merely concerned with passing on pure intelligence. In particular, they valued psychopathic traits among their offspring such as cunning, ruthlessness, and manipulativeness.

On the other hand, Bertrand Russell and his Fabian Socialist colleagues sought to foster dysgenic traits and characteristics among the rest of the general public. Above all, they desired a submissive and docile populace that was easily controlled. Through this process, the elite believed they could widen the cognitive disparity between ruler and ruled until they separated into different species entirely. At this point, it would become intellectually and psychologically impossible for the plebs to ever revolt against their masters. As Russell describes:

“Sires will be chosen for various qualities, some for muscle, others for brains. All will have to be healthy, and unless they are to be the fathers of oligarchs they will have to be of a submissive and docile disposition. Children will, as in Plato's Republic, be taken from their mothers and reared by professional nurses. Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become as unthinkable as an organized insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton. (The Aztecs kept a domesticated alien tribe for purposes of cannibalism. Their regime was totalitarian.)”

Russell advocates for a scientific regime that would sterilize ninety-five percent of males and seventy percent of females. However, the privileged aristocracy would be exempt from these sterilization mandates. The remaining fertile women would birth the necessary “cannon fodder” required for their future military operations. Russell reveals how human reproduction would be largely restricted to artificial insemination. These unborn children would in turn be subject to genetic engineering, “The system, one may surmise, will be something like this: except possibly in the governing aristocracy, all but 5 per cent of males and 30 per cent of females will be sterilized. The 30 per cent of females will be expected to spend the years from eighteen to forty in reproduction, in order to secure adequate cannon fodder. As a rule, artificial insemination will be preferred to the natural method. The unsterilized, if they desire the pleasures of love, will usually have to seek them with sterilized partners”. Here we see how depopulation and genetic engineering are deeply intertwined.

Aldous Huxley also described this type of eugenically stratified society throughout his novel “Brave New World”; one where humans were artificially created and genetically engineered into different caste classifications based on their predetermined intelligence. In more recent times, technocrats like former World Bank senior economist Herman Daly have posited using genetic engineering to create smaller and shorter people as well.

According to Russell, children should be removed from their mothers and reared by the medical establishment. During Chairman Mao’s Great Leap Forward, the People's Republic of China placed infants in communal nurseries while their parents worked the fields. This is an extremely effective method for destroying the family unit as children raised by strangers are less likely to bond with their own kin.

Bertrand Russell proclaims that the emerging scientific world state strives to abolish the family unit entirely. He states that future global citizens will regard the idea of familial relationships as something completely archaic and utterly bizarre, “To those accustomed to this system, the family as we know it would seem as queer as the tribal and totem organization of Australian aborigines seems to us”. Since government nurseries will raise artificially created humans away from their parents’ guidance, the state

will completely monopolize any social values that these children do receive. Parents will work such long hours that they will have little time for anything else.

Russell criticizes the family unit for engendering an inevitable level of domestic strife; and yet, Russell acknowledges that this emerging system, designed to replace the family itself, will produce far more evil and misery than even the most contentious household squabbles, “So long as the present family survives, there will be unrequited love and parents' tyranny and children's ingratitude; and if something new were substituted for the family, it would bring new evils, probably worse”. Despite this admission, Russell and his Fabian Socialist colleagues remain entirely committed to the destruction of the family. He understands that most human beings are fiercely loyal and protective towards their own kin. The world state will not tolerate any competing loyalties towards anything but itself.

Bertrand Russell concludes that all scientific governments inevitably adopt totalitarian policies. Still, Russell realizes that these societies require a great deal of stability and yet must not depend upon popular support, “I think the evils that have grown up in Soviet Russia will exist, in a greater or less degree, wherever there is a scientific government which is securely established and is not dependent upon popular support”. Thus, the so-called democracy of scientific governments must invariably descend into totalitarian brutality. Authoritarian force and manufactured consent combine to achieve societal subordination.

He contends that military strength is a primary factor towards the success or failure of totalitarian regimes. State monopolies on modern armaments effectively render grassroots revolutions impossible since popular uprisings always require substantial military support, “and the effectiveness of modern armaments makes popular risings impossible. No revolution can succeed in a modern country unless it has the support of at least a considerable section of the armed forces”. Although Russell doesn’t directly reference this aspect, scientific regimes also implement gun control policies to maintain their monopoly on violence.

Totalitarian regimes understand the importance of maintaining loyalty from their military, law enforcement, and state intelligence apparatus. So long as governments financially compensate their enforcers with a higher standard of living compared to their civilian counterparts, those agents and assets will willingly oppress their own countrymen indefinitely. As a result, the system’s very cruelty self-perpetuates its own stability, “But the armed forces can be kept loyal by being given a higher standard of life than that of the average worker, and this is made easier by every step in the degradation of ordinary labor. Thus the very evils of the system help to give it stability”. I feel this is an extremely revealing point that often gets overlooked. These systems are so difficult to resist because they’re designed in such a way that people’s self-interest or even their own survival depend upon their continuance; this is true

even if that very same system is ultimately deteriorating their personal and societal condition in the long run.

The lack of food security is another factor which scientific societies use to keep their populace in line. Totalitarian regimes always collectivize or centralize all food production under a single authority. This relates back to the issue of interdependence where individuals rely on a single source for their entire sustenance. When the ruling regime controls the distribution of food, the peasantry must either submit to its authority or face starvation, “When the government controls the distribution of food, its power is absolute so long as it can count on the police and the armed forces”. You can’t fight a war or even protest your lot without consuming your daily bread. This is why both communist and corporate capitalist states continuously consolidate food production.

Due to the aforementioned reasons, Russell believes that scientific regimes are unlikely to be destabilized or overthrown from grassroots opposition. However, Russell acknowledges that scientific societies remain vulnerable to both foreign and civil warfare, “Apart from the danger of war, I see no reason why such a regime should be unstable”. Still, Russell gives more credence to these depositions resulting from foreign intervention rather than intranational power struggles. This is because foreign governments are not subjected to the same level of surveillance that domestic political rivals face.

However, governmental anxiety over potential in-fighting greatly hinders the development of a scientific society. If the ruling regime encourages initiative and ambition amongst its governing officials, it creates a risk of intranational power struggles and subsequent coup d'états. Russell mentions how the late Roman Emperors would often conspire against or even execute their successful generals in fear that they might one day become a claimant to their throne, “If, on the other hand, initiative is encouraged in the people near the top, there will be constant danger of palace revolutions. One of the troubles in the late Roman Empire was that a successful general could, with luck, make himself Emperor, so that the reigning Emperor always had a motive for putting successful generals to death”. Ironically, a dictator’s tyrannical lust for power steadily weakens his regime in the long run.

As a result, tyrants prefer to carefully regulate and stifle scientific innovations to maintain their grasp on power. Russell references the Soviet’s strict adherence to the Lysenkoism theory of agriculture which resulted in the scientific suppression of thousands of mainstream biologists. New ideas are viewed with deep mistrust which hinders the regime’s adaptability. The governing class becomes lethargic and passive as a result, “We may perhaps go further: the causes which will make dictatorships lag behind in science will also generate other weaknesses. All new ideas will come to be viewed as heresy, so that there will be a lack of adaptability to new circumstances. The governing class will tend to become lazy as

soon as it feels secure". If the governing class becomes too complacent, the regime might gradually erode from popular discontent. This is the problem the scientific controllers face.

Russell seeks a solution to this inherent contradiction. One in which the ruling elite can maintain their privileged positions without fear of deposition while still advancing the scientific process upon which their power relies. According to Russell, a scientific dictatorship can only persist if it eventually transforms into a world state, "For these various reasons, I do not believe that dictatorship is a lasting form of scientific society—unless (but this proviso is important) it can become world-wide". Internal revolts would become utterly impossible under the combined might of a worldwide government. Not so coincidentally, Russell's solution coincides with the Fabians' world federalist agenda.

Bertrand Russell promotes several primary strategies to reduce the human population. First, he suggests the public should have unrestricted access to contraception. Next, he hints at abortion as a method of infanticide combined with high-casualty warfare. Finally, Russell suggests that the bulk of humanity might be kept in below subsistence level austerity, thus resulting in a high general mortality, "There are three ways of securing a society that shall be stable as regards population. The first is that of birth control, the second that of infanticide or really destructive wars, and the third that of general misery except for a powerful minority". Interestingly enough, Russell admits that all of these methods have been practiced in the past.

Australian aborigines used kangaroo apples as an archaic form of birth control. Russell cites Plutarch's allegations that Spartans regularly practiced infanticide in an effort to control their population's health. Lastly, Russell admits that both Western globalists and Russian communists have used extreme poverty as an effective method for depopulation, "All these methods have been practiced: the first, for example, by the Australian aborigines; the second by the Aztecs, the Spartans, and the rulers of Plato's Republic; the third in the world as some Western internationalists hope to make it and in Soviet Russia". Russell divulges that elites as far back as Plato have been deeply concerned with how best to control the quantity and quality of their respective populations.

Russell notes that industrialized countries consistently have lower birth rates than non-industrialized ones. At this point in history, most western nations were barely maintaining replacement levels of reproduction, "Prosperous industrial countries have low birth rates; Western nations barely maintain their numbers". Needless to say, this trend has only exacerbated in the eighty-one years since this book was first published.

However, Russell and his compatriots sought to eventually reduce the entire world's birth rates, not just the west. To accomplish this, Russell realized that eastern nations would need to industrialize as well, "If the East were to become as prosperous and as industrial as the West, the increase of population might become sufficiently slow to present no insoluble problem. At present Russia, China, and India are the three great reservoirs of procreation and poverty. If those countries reached the level of diffused well-being now existing in America their surplus population might cease to be a menace to the world". Russell targeted China, India, and Russia in particular as three of the most populated countries on the Eurasian landmass. This strategy has since bore some fruit. Chinese, Indian, and Russian birth rates per woman are now 1.28, 2.05, and 1.50 respectively.

The correlation between industrialization and respective fertility reduction is a primary motivation behind the elitist promotion of urban life. Former CIA agent Miles Copeland corroborated this point in his book "The Game of Nations. The Amorality of Power Politics", "We will be concerned exclusively with such questions as, What, if anything, is the Government of Azania doing about its population increase? About modernizing its agriculture? About increasing the productivity of its working force?" Copeland essentially admitted that the Central Intelligence Agency's primary ambition for its global operations is population reduction through modern industrialization. To be fair, there are other reasons why elites seek to resettle the bulk of humanity into urban centers but those are for another time and another book.

Bertrand Russell discloses that biological warfare could be a very effective method of populational control. Russell laments that conventional warfare has thus far been quite disappointing in quelling population growth. However, if the scientific dictatorship released a plague every generation to cull off a sizable fraction of the world's population, then perhaps man's reproductive instinct could be firmly held in check. Russell admits the shocking cruelty of this approach, but he accepts it with a callous indifference. According to Russell's twisted moral disposition, noble individuals are entirely unconcerned with the existence and well-being of others:

"I do not pretend that birth control is the only way in which population can be kept from increasing. There are others, which, one must suppose, opponents of birth control would prefer. War, as I remarked a moment ago, has hitherto been disappointing in this respect, but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. There would be nothing in this to offend the consciences of the devout or to restrain the ambitions of nationalists. The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's."

Russell views two major obstacles to the establishment of a scientific world government and its corresponding depopulation policies: religion and nationalism, "There are, however, two powerful forces

opposed to such a policy: one is religion, the other is nationalism". Patriots are, by their very nature, antipathetic to the constraints of international government. Therefore, Russell believes that national sovereignty must be eradicated entirely if a world authority is ever to emerge. Conversely, religions promote immutable moral values that are fundamentally opposed to Darwinist and Pragmatist "principles". Even more worrying for Russell, some religions prohibit the use of birth control which is essential for limiting populational growth.

Russell claims that if the human population is not strictly regulated by an international authority, then mankind will face an abundance of wars, pandemics, and famines, "If this is to be done otherwise than by wars, pestilences, and famines, it will demand a powerful international authority". In Russell's ideal scientific dictatorship, this world state would distribute a select quantity of food to each regional province. If any nation increased its population beyond these prearranged constraints, it would be denied any additional food to feed its people, "This authority should deal out the world's food to the various nations in proportion to their population at the time of the establishment of the authority. If any region subsequently increased its population it should not on that account receive any more food". Thus, every state would have a very strong motive to control their population numbers. Russell suggests that the world state should delegate the methods of depopulation to local government authorities.

Bertrand Russell continually uses the threat of war to validate the establishment of a world government. Otherwise, he claims that national warfare will continue to escalate until either humanity is wiped out to the point of extinction or our civilizations are reduced to prescientific primitivism, "Since war is likely to become more destructive of human life than it has been in recent centuries, unification under a single government is probably necessary unless we are to acquiesce in either a return to barbarism or the extinction of the human race". Russell contends that governments will try to continuously expand their population numbers for military advantage and thus require increased food production as a result. Competition for food will lead to additional military conflicts as every nation seeks to secure its own position.

In fact, he even hints at the concept of regionalism serving as an effective stepping stone for world federalism. He suggests that weaker, smaller nations might sacrifice their national sovereignty to integrate with their more powerful neighbors. They might see supranationalism as the only means by which to preserve their national defense and food security, "There will therefore be blocs in which the hungry nations band together against those that are well fed. That is the explanation of the victory of communism in China". Russell shrewdly understands that regionalist alliances are an effective method for consolidating economic and political power. The public might not consent to sacrificing their national sovereignty to an all-powerful world authority, but doing so for a regional authority is often an easier concession. These regional blocs can later be merged into a single world state at an opportune time.

Russell cunningly disputes that the problem of nationalistic strife could be resolved by any other means than a global state. According to Russell, only a world government with a complete monopoly of military force can curtail nationalistic rivalry and safeguard humanity's very existence, "Unless, at some stage, one power or group of powers emerges victorious and proceeds to establish a single government of the world with a monopoly of armed force, it is clear that the level of civilization must continually decline until scientific warfare becomes impossible-that is until science is extinct". Predictably, Russell gives no caution to the probability of a world state becoming even more tyrannical and democidal than any of its nationalistic forebearers.

Skeptics argue that Russell merely prognosticates on future societal trends, rather than surreptitiously designing them. They naively view him as a philanthropic benefactor who genuinely wants what is best for mankind. However, in his true Fabian fashion, the "benevolent" Russell can't help but give himself away. In his book "Marriage and Morals", Bertrand Russell chillingly prescribes his preferred system of government. He deliberately demoralizes his readership, conditioning them to the inevitability of a scientific tyranny. Yet despite this ostensible warning, Russell emphatically endorses scientific governance, knowing it will lead to totalitarian technocracy:

"Religion has existed since before the dawn of history, while science has existed for at most four centuries; but when science has become old and venerable, it will control our lives as much as religion has ever done. I foresee the time when all who care for the freedom of the human spirit will have to rebel against a scientific tyranny. Nevertheless, if there is to be a tyranny, it is better that it should be scientific."

Bertrand Russell's seminal book "The Impact of Science on Society" systematically blueprints the scientific component of the New World Order. Even eighty-four years later, Russell's invaluable insider knowledge is as timeless now as it was in 1942. Rather than relegated to the dustbin of history, eugenical science and philosophy have now re-emerged, more pernicious and prevalent than ever before. Technological innovations and psychological techniques have fundamentally altered man's natural behavior. Russell's dream of a global scientific dictatorship is now materializing right before our very eyes. For all its comforts and conveniences, the tyranny of scientific society threatens the very essence of our human dignity. If we are to preserve our collective humanity, then this global technocracy must be universally opposed.

I've provided a free link to the book below if you want to read it for yourself. I've also included a list of quotes to back up all of the assertions I've made in this analysis.

The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell:

https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.351235

“But although it is still open to the philosopher or theologian to hold that everything has a "purpose," it has been found that "purpose" is not a useful concept when we are in search of scientific laws. We are told in the Bible that the moon was made to give light by night. But men of science, however pious, do not regard this as a scientific explanation of the origin of the moon. Or, to revert to the question about cancer, a man of science may believe, in his private capacity, that cancer is sent as a punishment for our sins, but qua man of science he must ignore this point of view. We know of "purpose" in human affairs, and we may suppose that there are cosmic purposes, but in science it is the past that determines the future, not the future the past. "Final" causes, therefore, do not occur in the scientific account of the world.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 39

“What Galileo and Newton had done for astronomy, Darwin did for biology. The adaptations of animals and plants to their environments were a favorite theme of pious naturalists in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These adaptations were explained by the Divine Purpose. It is true that the explanation was sometimes a little odd. If rabbits were theologians, they might think the exquisite adaptation of weasels to the killing of rabbits hardly a matter for thankfulness. And there was a conspiracy of silence about the tapeworm. Nevertheless, it was difficult, before Darwin, to explain the adaptation of living things to their environment otherwise than by means of the Creator's purposes.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 39-40

“(4) Mans place in the universe: The effect of science upon our view of man's place in the universe has been of two opposite kinds; it has at once degraded and exalted him. It has degraded him from the standpoint of contemplation, and exalted him from that of action. The latter effect has gradually come to outweigh the former, but both have been important.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 40-41

“In the scientific world, all this is different. It is not by prayer and humility that you cause things to go as you wish, but by acquiring a knowledge of natural laws. The power you acquire in this way is much greater and much more reliable that that formerly supposed to be acquired by prayer, because you never could tell whether your prayer would be favorably heard in heaven. The power of prayer, moreover, had recognized limits; it would have been impious to ask too much. But the power of science has no known limits. We were told that faith could remove mountains, but no one believed it; we are now told that the atomic bomb can remove mountains, and everyone believes it.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 44

“Darwinism has had many effects upon man's outlook on life and the world, in addition to the extrusion of purpose of which I have already spoken. The absence of any sharp line between men and apes is very awkward for theology. When did men get souls? Was the Missing Link capable of sin and therefore worthy of hell? Did Pithecanthropus Erectus have moral responsibility? Was Homo Pekiniensis damned?

Did Piltdown Man go to heaven? Any answer must be arbitrary." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 45

"But Darwinism—especially when crudely misinterpreted —threatened not only theological orthodoxy but also the creed of eighteenth-century liberalism. Condorcet was a typical liberal philosopher of the eighteenth century; Malthus developed his theory to refute Condorcet; and Darwin's theory was suggested by Malthus's. Eighteenth-century liberals had a conception of man as absolute, in its way, as that of the theologians. There were the "Rights of Man"; all men were equal; if one showed more ability than another, that was due entirely to a better education, as James Mill told his son to prevent him from becoming conceited." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 45

"We must ask again: Should Pithecanthropus, if still alive, enjoy "The Rights of Man"? Would Homo Pekiniensis have been the equal of Newton if he could have gone to Cambridge? Was the Piltdown Man just as intelligent as the present inhabitants of that Sussex village? If you answer all all these questions in the democratic sense, you can be pushed back to the anthropoid apes, and if you stick to your guns, you can be driven back ultimately on to the amoeba, which is absurd (to quote Euclid) . You must therefore admit that men are not all congenitally equal, and that evolution proceeds by selecting favorable variations. You must admit that heredity has a part in producing a good adult, and that education is not the only factor to be considered. If men are to be conventionally equal politically, it must be not because they are really equal biologically, but for some more specifically political reason. Such reflections have endangered political liberalism, though not, to my mind, justly." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 45-46

"The fact that messages could travel faster than human beings was useful, above all, to the police. Before the telegraph, a highwayman on a galloping horse could escape to a place where his crime had not yet been heard of, and this made it very much harder to catch him. Unfortunately, however, the men whom the police wish to catch are frequently benefactors of mankind. If the telegraph had existed, Polycrates would have caught Pythagoras, the Athenian government would have caught Anaxagoras, the Pope would have caught William of Occam, and Pitt would have caught Tom Paine when he fled to France in 1792. A large proportion of the best Germans and Russians have suffered under Hitler and Stalin; many more would have escaped but for the rapid transmission of messages. The increased power of the police therefore, is not wholly a gain." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 55-56

"Increase of central control is an even more important consequence of the telegraph. In ancient empires satraps or proconsuls in distant provinces could rebel, and had time to entrench themselves before the central government knew of their disaffection. When Constantine proclaimed himself Emperor at York and marched on Rome, he was almost under the walls of the city before the Roman authorities knew he was coming. Perhaps if the telegraph had existed in those days the Western world would not now be Christian. In the War of 1812, the battle of New Orleans was fought after peace had been concluded, but neither army was aware of the fact. Before the telegraph, ambassadors had an independence which they have now completely lost, because they had to be allowed a free hand if swift action was necessary in a crisis." – The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 56

“This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship. Anaxagoras maintained that snow is black, but no one believed him. The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity. But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark gray.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 65

“Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 65-66

“A peasant in an unindustrialized country may produce almost all his own food by means of very inexpensive tools. These tools, some of his clothes, and a few things such as salt are all that he needs to buy. His relations with the outer world are thus reduced to a minimum. So long as he produces, with the help of his wife and children, a little more food than the family requires, he can enjoy almost complete independence, though at the cost of hardship and poverty. But in a time of famine he goes hungry, and probably most of his children die. His liberty is so dearly bought that few civilized men would change places with him. This was the lot of most of the population of civilized countries till the rise of industrialism.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 66-67

“By way of contrast with the primitive peasant, consider the agrarian interests in modern California or Canada or Australia or the Argentine. Everything is produced for export, and the prosperity to be brought by exporting depends upon such distant matters as war in Europe or Marshall Aid or the devaluation of the pound. Everything turns on politics, on whether the Farm Bloc is strong in Washington, whether there is reason to fear that Argentina may make friends with Russia, and so on. There may still be nominally independent farmers, but in fact they are in the power of the vast financial interests that are concerned in manipulating political issues. This interdependence is in no degree lessened—perhaps it is even increased—if the countries concerned are socialist, as, for example, if the Soviet Government and the British Government make a deal to exchange food for machinery. All this is the effect of scientific technique in agriculture. Malthus, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, wrote: "In the wildness of speculation it has been suggested (of course more in jest than in earnest) that Europe should grow its corn in America, and devote itself solely to manufactures and commerce." It turned out that the speculation was by no means "wild." ” – The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 68-69

“A scientific oligarchy, accordingly, is bound to become what is called "totalitarian, that is to say, all important forms of power will become a monopoly of the State. This monolithic system has sufficient merits to be attractive to many people, but to my mind its demerits are far greater than its merits. For some reason which I have failed to understand, many people like the system when it is Russian but disliked the very same system when it was German. I am compelled to think that this is due to the power of labels; these people like whatever is labeled "Left" without examining whether the label has any justification.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 84

“The completeness of the resulting control over opinion depends in various ways upon scientific technique. Where all children go to school, and all schools are controlled by the government, the authorities can close the minds of the young to everything contrary to official orthodoxy. Printing is impossible without paper, and all paper belongs to the State. Broadcasting and the cinema are equally public monopolies. The only remaining possibility of unauthorized propaganda is by secret whispers from one individual to another. But this, in turn, is rendered appallingly dangerous by improvements in the art of spying. Children at school are taught that it is their duty to denounce their parents if they allow themselves subversive utterances in the bosom of the family. No one can be sure that a man who seems to be his dearest friend will not denounce him to the police; the man may himself have been in some trouble, and may know that if he is not efficient as a spy his wife and children will suffer. All this is not imaginary; it is daily and hourly reality. Nor, given oligarchy, is there the slightest reason to expect anything else." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 86-87

“People still shudder at the enormities of men like Caligula and Nero, but their misdeeds fade into insignificance beside those of modern tyrants. Except among the upper classes in Rome, daily life was much as usual even under the worst emperors. Caligula wished his enemies had but a single head; how he would have envied Hitler the scientific lethal chambers of Auschwitz! Nero did his best to establish a spy system which would smell out traitors, but a conspiracy defeated him in the end. If he had been defended by the N.K.V.D. he might have died in his bed at a ripe old age. These are a few of the blessings that science has bestowed on tyrants.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 87-88

“Inevitably, forced labor, because it is economical, is favorably viewed by the authorities, and tends, by its competition, to depress the condition of "free" laborers. In the nature of things, unless the system is swept away, it must grow until no one is outside it except the army, the police, and government officials.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 90

“I think the evils that have grown up in Soviet Russia will exist, in a greater or less degree, wherever there is a scientific government which is securely established and is not dependent upon popular support. It is possible nowadays for a government to be very much more oppressive than any government could be before there was scientific technique. Propaganda makes persuasion easier for the government; public ownership of halls and paper makes counterpropaganda more difficult; and the effectiveness of modern armaments makes popular risings impossible. No revolution can succeed in a modern country unless it has the support of at least a considerable section of the armed forces. But the armed forces can be kept loyal by being given a higher standard of life than that of the average worker,

and this is made easier by every step in the degradation of ordinary labor. Thus the very evils of the system help to give it stability. Apart from external pressure, there is no reason why such a regime should not last for a very long time." – The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 91-92

"It is to be expected that advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have even in totalitarian countries. Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils have left school, they shall be incapable, throughout the rest of their lives, of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished. But in his day this was an unattainable ideal: what he regarded as the best system in existence produced Karl Marx. In future such failures are not likely to occur where there is dictatorship. Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 92

"A totalitarian government with a scientific bent might do things that to us would seem horrifying. The Nazis were more scientific than the present rulers of Russia, and were more inclined towards the sort of atrocities than I have in mind. They were said—I do not know with what truth—to use prisoners in concentration camps as material for all kinds of experiments, some involving death after much pain. If they had survived, they would probably have soon taken to scientific breeding. Any nation which adopts this practice will, within a generation, secure great military advantages. The system, one may surmise, will be something like this: except possibly in the governing aristocracy, all but 5 per cent of males and 30 per cent of females will be sterilized. The 30 per cent of females will be expected to spend the years from eighteen to forty in reproduction, in order to secure adequate cannon fodder. As a rule, artificial insemination will be preferred to the natural method. The unsterilized, if they desire the pleasures of love, will usually have to seek them with sterilized partners." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 92-93

"Sires will be chosen for various qualities, some for muscle, others for brains. All will have to be healthy, and unless they are to be the fathers of oligarchs they will have to be of a submissive and docile disposition. Children will, as in Plato's Republic, be taken from their mothers and reared by professional nurses. Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become as unthinkable as an organized insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton. (The Aztecs kept a domesticated alien tribe for purposes of cannibalism. Their regime was totalitarian.)" – The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 93

"To those accustomed to this system, the family as we know it would seem as queer as the tribal and totem organization of Australian aborigines seems to us." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 94

"To prevent these scientific horrors, democracy is necessary but not sufficient. There must be also that kind of respect for the individual that inspired the doctrine of the Rights of Man. As an absolute theory

the doctrine cannot be accepted. As Bentham said: "Rights of man, nonsense; imprescriptible rights of man, nonsense on stilts." We must admit that there are gains to the community so great that for their sake it becomes right to inflict an injustice on an individual. This may happen, to take an obvious example, if a victorious enemy demands hostages as the price of not destroying a city. The city authorities (not of course the enemy) cannot be blamed, in such circumstances, if they deliver the required number of hostages. In general, the "Rights of Man" must be subject to the supreme consideration of the general welfare. But having admitted this we must go on to assert, and to assert emphatically, that there are injuries which it is hardly ever in the general interest to inflict on innocent individuals. The doctrine is important because the holders of power, especially in an oligarchy, will be much too prone, on each occasion, to think that this is one of those cases in which the doctrine should be ignored." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 95

"Apart from the danger of war, I see no reason why such a regime should be unstable. After all, most civilized and semi-civilized countries known to history have had a large class of slaves or serfs completely subordinate to their owners. There is nothing in human nature that makes the persistence of such a system impossible. And the whole development of scientific technique has made it easier than it used to be to maintain a despotic rule of a minority. When the government controls the distribution of food, its power is absolute so long as it can count on the police and the armed forces. And their loyalty can be secured by giving them some of the privileges of the governing class. I do not see how any internal movement of revolt can ever bring freedom to the oppressed in a modem scientific dictatorship." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 98

"We may perhaps go further: the causes which will make dictatorships lag behind in science will also generate other weaknesses. All new ideas will come to be viewed as heresy, so that there will be a lack of adaptability to new circumstances. The governing class will tend to become lazy as soon as it feels secure. If, on the other hand, initiative is encouraged in the people near the top, there will be constant danger of palace revolutions. One of the troubles in the late Roman Empire was that a successful general could, with luck, make himself Emperor, so that the reigning Emperor always had a motive for putting successful generals to death. This sort of trouble can easily arise in a dictatorship, as events have already proved. For these various reasons, I do not believe that dictatorship is a lasting form of scientific society—unless (but this proviso is important) it can become world-wide." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 99

"In industry there is room for a great deal of devolution. For many years the Labour Party has advocated nationalization of railways, and most railway employees have supported the Party in this. But now a good many of them are finding that the State is, after all, not so very different from a private company. It is equally remote, and under a Conservative government it will be equally likely to be on bad terms with the unions. In fact nationalization needs to be supplemented by a measure of limited self-government for the railways, the railway government being elected democratically by the employees." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 108

"Now, especially in a small country like ours, there would be no difficulty in allocating certain governmental functions to bodies like the trade unions, which classify people by their occupation, not by

their habitation. The foreign relations of an industry are access to raw material, quantity and price of finished product. These it should not control. But everything else it should be free to decide for itself.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 109

“My own belief is that a collective profit motive can be, and should be, combined with socialism. Take, say, coal mining. The State should decide, at the beginning of each year, what prices it is prepared to pay for coal of various qualities. Methods of mining should be left to the industry. Every technical improvement would then result in more coal or less work for miners. The profit motive, in a new form, would survive, but without the old evils. By devolution, the motive could be made to operate on each mine.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 112

“But if human life is to continue in spite of science, mankind will have to learn a discipline of the passions which, in the past, has not been necessary. Men will have to submit to the law, even when they think the law unjust and iniquitous. Nations which are persuaded that they are only demanding the barest justice will have to acquiesce when this demand is denied them by the neutral authority. I do not say that this is easy; I do not prophesy that it will happen; I say only that if it does not happen the human race will perish, and will perish as a result of science.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 128

“From the point of view of technical philosophy, this theory has been best developed by John Dewey, who is universally acknowledged as America's most eminent philosopher. This philosophy has two aspects, one theoretical and the other ethical. On the theoretical side, it analyzes away the concept "truth," for which it substitutes "utility." It used to be thought that, if you believed Caesar crossed the Rubicon, you believed truly, because Caesar did cross the Rubicon. Not so, say the philosophers we are considering: to say that your belief is "true" is another way of saying that you will find it more profitable than the opposite belief.” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 131

“But this kind of objection is swept aside by the contention that a belief may be "true" at one time and "false" at another. In 1920 it was "true" that Trotsky had a great part in the Russian Revolution; in 1930 it was "false." The results of this view have been admirably worked out in George Orwell's ''1984." ” - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 131-132

“The third attraction of pragmatism—which cannot be wholly separated from the second—is love of power. Most men's desires are of various kinds. There are the pleasures of sense; there are aesthetic pleasures and pleasures of contemplation; there are private affections; and there is power. In an individual, any one of these may acquire predominance over the others. If love of power dominates, you arrive at Marx's view that what is important is not to understand the world, but to change it. Traditional theories of knowledge were invented by men who loved contemplation—a monkish taste, according to modern devotees of mechanism. Mechanism augments human power to an enormous degree. It is therefore this aspect of science that attracts the lovers of power. And if power is all you want from science, the pragmatist theory gives you just what you want, without accretions that to you seem irrelevant. It gives you even more than you could have expected, for if you control the police it gives you the godlike power of making truth. You cannot make the sun cold, but you can confer pragmatic “truth"

on the proposition "the sun is cold" if you can ensure that everyone who denies it is liquidated. I doubt whether Zeus could do more." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 133-134

"Let us now try to sum up what increases in human happiness science has rendered possible, and what ancient evils it is in danger of intensifying. I do not pretend that there is any way of arriving at the millennium. Whatever our social institutions, there will be death and illness (though in a diminishing quantity); there will be old age and insanity; there will be either danger or boredom. So long as the present family survives, there will be unrequited love and parents' tyranny and children's ingratitude; and if something new were substituted for the family, it would bring new evils, probably worse. Human life cannot be made a matter of unalloyed bliss, and to allow oneself excessive hopes is to court disappointment." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 137

"The general diminution of lawlessness and crimes of violence would not have been possible without science. If you read eighteenth-century novels, you get a strange impression of London: unlighted streets, footpads and highwaymen, nothing that we should count as a police force, but, in a futile attempt to compensate for all this, an abominably savage and ferocious criminal law. Street lighting, telephones, finger-printing, and the psychology of crime and punishment are scientific advances which have made it possible for the police to reduce crime below anything that the most Utopian philosopher of the "Age of Reason" would have imagined possible." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 140

"What, then, can we do? Apart from certain deep-seated prejudices, the answer would be obvious. The nations which at present increase rapidly should be encouraged to adopt the methods by which, in the West, the increase of population has been checked. Educational propaganda, with government help, could achieve this result in a generation. There are, however, two powerful forces opposed to such a policy: one is religion, the other is nationalism. I think it is the duty of all who are capable of facing facts to realize, and to proclaim, that opposition to the spread of birth control, if successful, must inflict upon mankind the most appalling depth of misery and degradation, and that within another fifty years or so." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 164-165

"I do not pretend that birth control is the only way in which population can be kept from increasing. There are others, which, one must suppose, opponents of birth control would prefer. War, as I remarked a moment ago, has hitherto been disappointing in this respect, but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. There would be nothing in this to offend the consciences of the devout or to restrain the ambitions of nationalists. The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 165

"There are three ways of securing a society that shall be stable as regards population. The first is that of birth control, the second that of infanticide or really destructive wars, and the third that of general misery except for a powerful minority. All these methods have been practiced: the first, for example, by the Australian aborigines; the second by the Aztecs, the Spartans, and the rulers of Plato's Republic; the

third in the world as some Western internationalists hope to make it and in Soviet Russia." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 165-166

"Meanwhile, so long as there is not a single world government there will be competition for power among the different nations. And as increase of population brings the threat of famine, national power will become more and more obviously the only way of avoiding starvation. There will therefore be blocs in which the hungry nations band together against those that are well fed. That is the explanation of the victory of communism in China. These considerations prove that a scientific world society cannot be stable unless there is a world government." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 166

"It may be said, however, that this is a hasty conclusion. All that follows directly from what has been said is 'that, unless there is a world government which' secures universal birth control, there must from time to time be great wars, in which the penalty of defeat is widespread death by starvation. That is exactly the present state of the world, and some may hold that there is no reason why it should not continue for centuries. I do not myself believe that this is possible. The two great wars that we have experienced have lowered the level of civilization in many parts of the world, and the next is pretty sure to achieve much more in this direction. Unless, at some stage, one power or group of powers emerges victorious and proceeds to establish a single government of the world with a monopoly of armed force, it is clear that the level of civilization must continually decline until scientific warfare becomes impossible-that is until science is extinct." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 166-167

"The need for a world government, if the population problem is to be solved in any humane manner, is completely evident on Darwinian principles. Given two groups, of which one has an increasing and the other a stationary population, the one with the increasing population will (other things being equal) in time become the stronger. After victory, it will cut down the food supply of the vanquished, of whom many will die. 1 Therefore there will be a continually renewed victory of those nations that, from a world point of view, are unduly prolific. This is merely the modern form of the old struggle for existence. And given scientific powers of destruction, a world which allows this struggle to continue cannot be stable." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 167-168

"Soil and raw materials must not be used up so fast that scientific progress cannot continually make good the loss by means of new inventions and discoveries. Scientific progress is therefore a condition, not merely of social progress, but even of maintaining the degree of prosperity already achieved. Given a stationary technique, the raw materials that it requires will be used up in no very long time. If raw materials are not to be used up too fast, there must not be free competition for their acquisition and use but an international authority to ration them in such quantities as may from time to time seem compatible with continued industrial prosperity. And similar considerations apply to soil conservation." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 174-175

"Second, as regards population. If there is not to be a permanent and increasing shortage of food, agriculture must be conducted by methods which are not wasteful of soil, and increase of population must not outrun the increase in food production rendered possible by technical improvements. At present neither condition is fulfilled. The population of the world is increasing, and its capacity for food

production is diminishing. Such a state of affairs obviously cannot continue very long without producing a cataclysm." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 175

"To deal with this problem it will be necessary to find ways of preventing an increase in world population. If this is to be done otherwise than by wars, pestilences, and famines, it will demand a powerful international authority. This authority should deal out the world's food to the various nations in proportion to their population at the time of the establishment of the authority. If any nation subsequently increased its population it should not on that account receive any more food. The motive for not increasing population would therefore be very compelling. What method of preventing an increase might be preferred should be left to each State to decide." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 175-176

"Taking a long view, however, it is by no means impossible that the population problem will in time solve itself. Prosperous industrial countries have low birth rates; Western nations barely maintain their numbers. If the East were to become as prosperous and as industrial as the West, the increase of population might become sufficiently slow to present no insoluble problem. At present Russia, China, and India are the three great reservoirs of procreation and poverty. If those countries reached the level of diffused well-being now existing in America their surplus population might cease to be a menace to the world." - The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 176-177

"In general terms, we may say that so far as the population problem is concerned a scientific society could be stable if all the world were as prosperous as America is now. The difficulty, however, is to reach this economic paradise without a previous success in limiting population." – The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Page 177

"My conclusion is that a scientific society can be stable given certain conditions. The first of these is a single government of the whole world, possessing a monopoly of armed force and therefore able to enforce peace. The second condition is a general diffusion of prosperity, so that there is no occasion for envy of one part of the world by another. The third condition (which supposes the second fulfilled) is a low birth rate everywhere, so that the population of the world becomes stationary, or nearly so. The fourth condition is the provision for individual initiative both in work and in play, and the greatest diffusion of power compatible with maintaining the necessary political and economic framework." – The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell, Pages 178-179

Here's a few quality videos that delve into the history and writings of the Fabian Society and Bertrand Russell specifically. They are good introductory primers if you are new to these subjects and wish to learn more.

List of Videos:

Bertrand Russell - The Impact of Science on Society:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nozIg89LyY0

Alan Watt - The Impact of Science on Society:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a-UF23DFxvc

Edited - "Cutting Through the Matrix" with Alan Watt - Redux 123 - "Who Is In Charge?" Aug. 20, 2023:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IhuFgQ0xONw

Alan Watt - Bertrand Russell's special school 1930's:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NQRZRSIwnjU

The Bertrand Russell Hustle explained by Alan Watt:

https://www.bitchute.com/video/VvszsmEC1ZkM/

Enjoy the Decline: The Open Conspiracy:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VB67kOo08w4

Understanding the Fabian Window:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s9oqgQ16qc8

Alan Watt and Thomas Sheridan: Fabians and Aliens - Hour 1:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZN2Zq9hkqGs

Alan Watt and Thomas Sheridan: Fabians and Aliens - Hour 2:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gLWxcOhEVMo

George Bernard Shaw: Justify Your Existence:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FQXAqP6ReqY

Here's a few other threads I've made that go into different aspects of the world government conspiracy and agenda. They're not all directly related to the Fabian Society, but there are many different sides of the pyramid. There's thousands of think tanks, foundations, corporations, religious organizations and governmental agencies involved in this, obviously.

List of Threads:

Elite Bloodline Round Table Group/WEF/Bilderberg Group/Trilateral Commission Members (Part 1):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/370693820/

Elite Bloodline Round Table Group/WEF/Bilderberg Group/Trilateral Commission Members (Part 2):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/438769754/

Elite Bloodline Round Table Group/WEF/Bilderberg Group/Trilateral Commission Members (Part 3):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/457828884/

Elite Bloodline Round Table Group/WEF/Bilderberg Group/Trilateral Commission Members (Part 4):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/495127074/

Elite Bloodline Round Table Group/WEF/Bilderberg Group/Trilateral Commission Members (Part 5):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/502288043/

Elite Bloodline Round Table Group/WEF/Bilderberg Group/Trilateral Commission Members (Part 6):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/518174334/

Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Rockefeller "Philanthropy" thread:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/367027212/

Memoryholed/Redpill Documentaries, Articles, Videos, etc:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/356397077/

Elite Bloodline Central Banking Members (Part 1):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/419378896/

Elite Bloodline Central Banking Members (Part 2):

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/509362925/

Information on Rothschild family:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/380174569/

List of Roundtable Group member CEOs, Board of Directors and executives:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/383999350/

Depopulation Writings and information:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/385383532/

Russia in the Shadows by H.G. Wells Analysis:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/410957172/

Fabianism and the Empire: A Manifesto by the Fabian Society by George Bernard Shaw Analysis:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/415350512/

UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy by Julian Huxley Analysis:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/423609550/

The Impact of Science on Society by Bertrand Russell Analysis:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/445980732

The Open Conspiracy by H.G. Wells Analysis:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/451844211/

The Next Million Years by Charles Galton Darwin Analysis:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/490184909

Open Society Foundations Information:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/369261705/

Elite Bloodline and Secret Society Information on Sport Leagues:

https://archive.4plebs.org/pol/thread/433595063/

It's also worth mentioning that the Fabian Society, similar to the Roundtable Group network, has branches in other countries. There is the Australian Fabian Society in Australia, the Douglas–Coldwell Foundation in Canada and the New Zealand Fabian Society in New Zealand.

In the Dodd Report to the Reece Committee on Foundations, Norman Dodd compared an organization called the League for Industrial Democracy to the Fabian Society.

He stated, "The league for Industrial Democracy came into being in 1905, when it was known as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, for the purpose of awakening the intellectuals of this country to the ideas and benefits of socialism. This organization might be compared to the Fabian Society in England, which was established in 1884 to spread socialism by peaceful means".

Also, Similar to the World Economic Forum's Young Global Shapers and Young Global Leaders, the Fabian Society has a youth recruitment program known as the Young Fabians. Similar, also, to the Rhodes Scholarship for the Roundtable Groups, these people are groomed for important roles from a young age.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fabian_Society

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Fabian_Society

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Douglas%E2%80%93Coldwell_Foundation

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Young_Fabians

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intercollegiate_Socialist_Society

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_for_Industrial_Democracy

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coefficients_(dining_club)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fabian_Window

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fabian_strategy

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_for_Social_Reconstruction

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labour_Party_(UK)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/London_School_of_Economics

I haven't mentioned this in this thread yet, but the Fabian Society was named after the Roman Consul and dictator Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus of the Fabia Patrician family. He fought against Hannibal Barca and the Carthage empire during the Second Punic War.

Since Hannibal was one of the greatest generals in human history and Rome kept losing pitched battles to him, Fabius decided to avoid fighting him directly. Instead, he would attack Hannibal's foraging parties, disrupt his supply lines, shadow his movements and implement scorched earth tactics. All of this was part of an incremental process of trying to wear and whittle down the strength of Hannibal's army until it could be defeated one it was weak.

This is the same strategy Michael Andreas Barclay de Tolly used against Napoleon when he invaded Russia for example.

The Fabians decided to apply this same strategy of incrementalism to politics and culture through what is known as the "Fabian Strategy".

The organization's first pamphlet described this strategy, "For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did most patiently when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain, and fruitless". I think we're currently seeing the end of the Fabian Strategy in our lifetimes as they're at a point now where they need to forgo incrementalism to land the killing blow so to speak or risk losing their advantage. That's why things are speeding up so quickly since 2020.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quintus_Fabius_Maximus_Verrucosus

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fabian_strategy

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XHEAdlDrWM4

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9PtK0e1eWo8

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Fziza6B0TU

This is the "Fabian Window" that was designed by George Bernard Shaw. It depicts the founders of the Fabian Society such as Edward R. Pease, George Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb on the top level. They are hammering the world on top of the anvil which symbolizes them reshaping the world into their vision. Similar to the Roundtable Groups, the Fabian Society has both an inner circle or society of elects as well as an outer circle or association of helpers.

The helpers are down below on the second level as they are not privy to the same level of secret knowledge as the members of the inner circle. Still, they are shown to be praying to represent an almost religious like devotion to this cause of world government. This also demonstrates the contrast between the violent revolutionary model of the Bolsheviks and the “peaceful” Fabian model of incremental subversion.

I think that's Wells in the green shirt on the far left of the bottom level. Annie Besant, Graham Wallas, Hubert Bland, Edith Nesbit, Sydney Olivier, Oliver Lodge, Leonard Woolf, and Emmeline Pankhurst are also included on the lower panel as well.

Also, the Fabian Society's original coat of arms can be seen on the top level. It's a wolf in sheep's clothing. It represents the true psychopathic and ruthless nature of this organization and its members under the guise of benevolent socialism for the poor. However, they abandoned this pretty early on when they realized that this was a bit too on the nose and would give them away to an extent. Instead, they often use the turtle to represent the Fabian Strategy of gradualism.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fabian_Window

https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsehistory/2017/09/13/hammering-out-a-new-world-the-fabian-window-at-lse/

Tony Blair was a member of the Fabian Society as well. Blair was had given speeches and published papers at the organization. The guy is a monster. Take a look at this clip of him talking about how the state should be monitoring children's behavior from even before their own births and implementing thought crime policies based on these risk factors. This is where organizations like Getting it right for every child (GIRFEC) come in with their "state appointed guardians" as well. Governmental agencies and

psychological professionals will be intruding into family life (those that even still exist) to unprecedented extents under these programs. Absolutely horrifying.

Another Anon reminded me on the previous thread that Tony Blair's foundation known as "Tony Blair Institute's Tech Policy Fellowship" that has been doing work on the implementation of CBDCs (central bank digital currencies).

"After Tony Blair's landslide victory in 1997, over 200 Fabians sat in the House of Commons, including many of the cabinet. The society developed its role as a critical friend, supporting the Blair and Brown government's in developing policy, without being afraid to draw attention to the omissions or shortcomings of the government."

https://fabians.org.uk/about-us/our-history/

"Some in the society, whose membership includes cabinet ministers like Tony Blair, Chris Smith, Robin Cook and Jack Straw, are also concerned that a socialist society which has endured since 1884 should not ally itself inextricably with New Labour language."

https://www.theguardian.com/politics/1999/aug/20/uk.thinktanks

https://twitter.com/taschalabs/status/1565806891208523776

Tony Blair discusses childrens prebirth criminal database:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GJqvh3raOm4

It's interesting that there's a subdivision of the Fabian Society known as the Fabian Women's Network as well for their female members. This coincides with members like Annie Besant and Emmeline Pankhurst who were leaders in the British Suffragette movement. The birth control advocate, Marie Stopes, who founded the first birth control clinic in Britain was close with members of the Fabian Society. She once gave a talk about birth control at a Fabian Society meeting.

Also, did you know that Margaret Sanger (the founder of the American Birth Control League and later president of the International Planned Parenthood Federation) was a lover of Fabian Society members H.G. Wells? All of these people were in the same circles.

"Visit the Fabian Women's Network website

We are a voluntary section of the Fabian Society, alongside local societies, the Young Fabians, Scottish Fabians and Welsh Fabians. There are approximately 2,250 women in the Fabian Women's Network of all ages and backgrounds. We are proud to have an intersectional ethos to our membership.

FWN is run autonomously by a voluntary committee with our own constitution. Twelve members are elected bi-annually in an online ballot of members at the same time as Fabian executive committee elections. The committee elects its chair and officers who are then ratified at our AGM. The administration of membership and elections sits with the Fabian Society staff team.

The Fabian Women's Network aims to bring people together to:

create a thriving network for social and political change and influence political decision making and policy

connect Fabian networks with Fabian Women who are parliamentarians and those who hold other positions which publicly promote women's issues;

provide new ways in which women from all backgrounds and sectors can engage in topical policy debates."

https://fabians.org.uk/membership/fabian-women/

Also, this is somewhat common knowledge, but I forgot to mention that Sanger's American Birth Control League clinic was heavily funded by John D. Rockefeller Jr. and his family. The Rockefellers continue to heavily fund Planned Parenthood to this very day.

The Passionate Friends: H. G. Wells and Margaret Sanger at sanger.hosting.nyu.edu:

https://sanger.hosting.nyu.edu/articles/passionate_friends/

Newsletter #12 (Spring 1996)

The Passionate Friends: H. G. Wells and Margaret Sanger

Newsletter #12 (Spring 1996)

"From 1920 on I never went to England without spending part of the time with H. G.," wrote Margaret Sanger in her 1938 Autobiography. "England," she wrote upon the death of H. G. Wells fifty years ago this August, "means London, and London means H. G. Wells" (Tribute to H. G. Wells, August 14, 1946, MSM S83:611). From the time they met in 1920 until his death, Margaret Sanger and H. G. Wells carried on an infrequent, but often fervent love affair, sustained a deep professional friendship that particularly aided Sanger in her birth control work, and maintained an overseas correspondence about love and war, birth control and the Catholic Church, their travels, and public scrutiny of their lives.

Both were well known to the other in 1920 when they met for the first time at Wells' Easton Glebe estate in Essex. Sanger had gained notoriety in England for her several birth control publications and her work with the British neo-Malthusians, while H. G. Wells was enjoying the apex of his popularity as distinguished author, social theorist, and spirited polymath. Wells had already become a public supporter of Sanger's work. In 1916 he signed a letter to Woodrow Wilson, along with seven other prominent English supporters of birth control, protesting the indictments against Sanger stemming from her publication of the Woman Rebel.”

H.G. Wells wrote a foreword for Margaret Sanger's book "The Pivot of Civilization" where he blatantly admits that he wants to depopulate the lower classes. He also mentions his desire to create a world government.

The Pivot of Civilization by Margaret Sanger (1922):

https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1689/1689-h/1689-h.htm

"Introduction

The New Civilization is saying to the Old now: "We cannot go on making power for you to spend upon international conflict. You must stop waving flags and bandying insults. You must organize the Peace of the World; you must subdue yourselves to the Federation of all mankind. And we cannot go on giving you health, freedom, enlargement, limitless wealth, if all our gifts to you are to be swamped by an indiscriminate torrent of progeny. We want fewer and better children who can be reared up to their full possibilities in unencumbered homes, and we cannot make the social life and the world-peace we are determined to make, with the ill-bred, ill-trained swarms of inferior citizens that you inflict upon us." And there at the passionate and crucial question, this essential and fundamental question, whether procreation is still to be a superstitious and often disastrous mystery, undertaken in fear and ignorance, reluctantly and under the sway of blind desires, or whether it is to become a deliberate creative act, the two civilizations join issue now. It is a conflict from which it is almost impossible to abstain. Our acts, our way of living, our social tolerance, our very silences will count in this crucial decision between the old and the new.

H.G. Wells

Easton Glebe, Dunmow,

Essex., England"

It's also worth noting that the London School of Economics is an offshoot of the Fabian Society and was founded by members Sidney Webb, Beatrice Webb, Graham Wallas and George Bernard Shaw. The London School of Economic is one of the most important universities in the world for the elite. Obviously, there's many others like Oxford, Yale, Georgetown, Fordham and so on. But when you're looking into the backgrounds of various people within the power structure definitely take note if they happen an alumnus of that university. A beaver adorns the school's coat of arms which coincides with the Fabian Socialist approach of steady and gradual incrementalism.

Also, the school is heavily funded by the Rockefeller Foundation which I've covered in my Rockefeller "Philanthropy" thread. Considering the amount of effort the Fabians focus on education, it shouldn't be surprising that they created their own university.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/London_School_of_Economics

The Coefficients dining club that was founded by founded in 1902 by the Fabian Society members Sidney and Beatrice Webb is also worth learning about. This is important because it's another organizational structure where we see coordination between the Fabian Society and the Rountable Group network. Other Fabians like Bertrand Russell and H.G. Wells were members of this dining club. But so were members of the Roundtable Group network like Alfred Milner, Edward Grey, Leo Amery. The Tories were represented by economist William Hewins and editor of the National Review Leopold Maxse. Naval officer Commander Carlyon Wilfroy Bellairs was also a member of this informal group. Sir Halford John Mackinder, the creator of "Heartland Theory" and "Rimland theory", was also an attendee. Lots of powerful and influential people were members of this little quaint dining club.

Earlier this year, I read Halford Mackinder's essay "The Geographical Pivot of History" for the first time. I was thinking about making a thread about it, but I want to read some of his other essays first before I do that. It's interesting. Mackinder wrote an essay titled "The Round World and the Winning of the Peace" which was actually published by Foreign Affairs (the Council on Foreign Relation's official magazine).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coefficients_(dining_club)

Here's a list of important videos and articles on the Round Table Network as well as the WEF. The video titled “Alan Watt - Great Britain, Embryo of World Government” is the extremely important video I mentioned earlier. In that video, Alan Watt analyses the book “British Commonwealth and the Future: Proceedings of the Second Unofficial Conference on British Commonwealth Relations, Sydney 3rd-17th September, 1938” edited by Henry Vincent Hodson. I would recommend that everyone watch this video if you want to learn more about these topics. That book is a goldmine of information on the Roundtable Groups and the world government project. I plan to do my own analysis on it one day. Also, this info graph I will link to this post has a lot of interesting quotes from that book. I will also include a link of the book itself if you want a pdf of it.

Alan Watt - Great Britain, Embryo of World Government:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0_sVdiO-31Q

https://archive.org/details/britishcommonwea00comm

Behind the Big News: Propaganda and the CFR:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fmKiiY_HqsY

The Insiders (JBS Documentary on the Council on Foreign Relations & Trilateral Commission):

https://vimeo.com/534918814

Lecture by James Perloff: The Council on Foreign Relations:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e2Pmr0939qc

G. Edward Griffin at the University of Texas 4/29/2008: The Quigley Formula:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FoMezGPkyzU

Hillary Clinton admits that the CFR runs the Government:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LYq3TaBik64

Infowars - Bill Clinton speaks of Carroll Quigley at 1992 Democratic National Convention:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A76LFGtWhRQ

Dick Cheney ex-director of CFR talks to David Rockefeller:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BbnpN07J_zg

Did Bill Gates & World Economic Forum Predict Coronavirus Outbreak? An Inside Look May Shock You!:

https://www.bitchute.com/video/nOKqxcgEoX3z/

The Cia & The Cultural Cold War "REMAKE" Alan Watt:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qa8WgkIKNws

History... The Last Will of Cecil Rhodes and the Anglo-American Establishment:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pwwYuW2tzUo

Enjoy the Decline: Analysis of "The Great Reset" by Klaus Schwab:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=65LhtASSU4o

Enjoy the Decline: Analysis of "Between Two Ages" by Zbigniew Brzezinski:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DQDaRInwtjM

Here are a few extremely important articles written by or about the Roundtable Groups in case anybody is interested.

List of Articles:

From Empire to Commonwealth by Philip Kerr, Foreign Affairs, December 15, 1922, Vol. 1, No. 2. Pages 97-97.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/20028216?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

https://archive.org/details/jstor-20028216

Foreign Affairs. Catastrophic Terrorism: Tackling the New Danger. Authors: Ash Carter John M. Deutch Philip D. Zelikow | November / December 1998

https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/catastrophic-terrorism-tackling-new-danger

FOREIGN AFFAIRS. APRIL 1974. The Hard Road to World Order by Richard N. Gardner

https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B7UjwZXfLpG6a21IeEgyTHZsSk0/preview

1877: Cecil Rhodes, "Confession of Faith".

https://pages.uoregon.edu/kimball/Rhodes-Confession.htm

RULING CLASS JOURNALISTS by Richard Harwood on October 30, 1993

https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1993/10/30/ruling-class-journalists/761e7bf8-025d-474e-81cb-92dcf271571e/

Here's how life could change in my city by the year 2030 by Ida Auken on November 11, 2016 at weforum.org.

https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/11/how-life-could-change-2030/

https://www.forbes.com/sites/worldeconomicforum/2016/11/10/shopping-i-cant-really-remember-what-that-is-or-how-differently-well-live-in-2030/?sh=6f29c5cc1735

Creating a North American Community. Chairmen's Statement. Independent Task Force on the Future of North America. Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations in association with the Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales and the Canadian Council of Chief Executives.

https://gothinkblog.com/wp-content/uploads/creat_NA_comm.pdf

The Next American Contribution to Civilization by Charles W. Eliot from Foreign Affairs, September 15, 1922, Vol 1., No. 1, pp 19-65

https://www.jstor.org/stable/20028197?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

COVID-19 as a Case for Social Scoring Systems by Jesse Hirsh on September 15, 2020 at cigionline.org (Centre for International Governance Innovation):

https://www.cigionline.org/articles/covid-19-case-social-scoring-systems/

This credit card has a carbon-emission spending limit by Charlotte Edmond on May 13, 2019 at weforum.org:

https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/05/this-credit-card-has-a-carbon-emission-spending-limit/

Opening up the Order. A More Inclusive International System by Annie-Marie Slaughter and Gordon LaForge February 25, 2021 (Foreign Affairs):

https://www.wita.org/atp-research/inclusive-international-system/

Nationalism and Economic Life by Leon Trotsky on April 1934(Foreign Affairs):

https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1934/xx/nationalism.htm

The United States and the New International Court by Manley O. Hudson on January 1923 (Foreign Affairs):

https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20660185.pdf

Let's go back briefly to the Indian Independence movement for a second. Jawaharlal Nehru was a principal leader of the Indian nationalist movement in the 1930s and 1940s. Nehru's father had twice served as president of the Indian National Congress in 1919 and 1928. His elder sister, Vijaya Lakshmi, later became the first female president of the United Nations General Assembly. Nehru created the Objective Resolution which laid down the underlying principles of the Indian constitution. This later became the Preamble of the Constitution..

However, Jawaharlal Nehru was also a Fabian Socialist belonging to the Fabian Society. On January 26, 1950, he became the first Prime Minister of India. Nerhu commented on Fabian Society member and Indian Indepdence advocate Annie Besant that, "[Besant] had a very powerful influence on me in my childhood .. even later when I entered political life her influence continued".

So, you can clearly see how the Fabians and the Roundtable Group members were pushing for Indian national independence within both Britain and India itself. This whole movement was entirely orchestrated by these groups.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jawaharlal_Nehru

Obafemi Awolowo was the Premier of the now defunct Western Nigeria from October 1, 1954 through October 1, 1960. He played a key role in Nigeria's independence movement in the late 1950s. Later on, he became federal commissioner for finance, and vice chairman of the Federal Executive Council during the Nigerian Civil War. Earlier in his life, he was a correspondent for the Nigerian Times.

However, he was also a member of the Fabian Society. Once again, we see how the Fabian Society has groomed and initiated prominent aspiring politicians from colonial countries to lead national independence movements. This is definitely not a coincidence. It's a deliberately strategy to achieve world government as these various books demonstrate.

Today, the Roundtable Group within Nigeria is known as the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.

"Obafemi Awolowo

1909-1987

Nigerian politician, nationalist and writer

Sitter in 13 portraits"

https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/group/1315/Fabian%20Society

Muhammad Ali Jinnah was the first Governor-General of Pakistan during King George VI's reign. He held this position from August 14, 1947 to September 11, 1948. He was also the 1st Speaker of the Constituent Assembly, Pakistan's legislative branch, from August 11, 1947 to September 11, 1948. Jinnah was the leader of the All-India Muslim League from 1913 until the creation of Pakistan in 1947. He helped millions of Muslim migrants who emigrate from neighboring India to Pakistan after the two state partition of India. Jinah was invited to the first and second Indian Round Table Conferences which centered on constitutional reforms in India. Jinnah was a supposedly a member of the Fabian Society.

"In a detailed post on Facebook, Siddiqa said: "Muhammad Ali Jinnah went to London in late 1890s and lived in Kensington. The house there has a plaque in his name and says he lived there in 1895. He had

gone to hear the speech of Dadabhoy Nooroji who got elected to the House of Commons around that time."

She said that the neighborhood "still doesn't compare with Hampstead where he went to live later in 1930. He first joined the Fabian Society which later became Labour Party and wanted to get a ticket and contest elections like Dadabhoy Nooroji"."

https://dnanews.com.pk/take-trip-around-quaid-e-azams-london-residence/

Michel Aflaq was a Syrian philosopher, sociologist and Arab nationalist. He was a founder of the Arab Ba'athism national ideology which promotes the creation and development of a unified Arab state governed by a revolutionary socialist government. He was the Secretary General of the National Command of the Iraq-based Ba'ath Party and the Secretary General of the National Command of the Arab Socialist Ba'ath Party in Syria. Michel Aflaq was allegedly a member of the Fabian Society.

"Michel Aflaq, widely considered as the founder of the Ba'athist movement, was a Fabian socialist. Aflaq's ideas, with those of Salah al-Din al-Bitar and Zaki al-Arsuzi, came to fruition in the Arab world in the form of dictatorial regimes in Iraq and Syria.[29]"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fabian_Society

Salama Moussa was an Egyotian journalist, writer and political theorist. He was also an Egyptian nationalist and supporter of Egyptian liberalism. He helped popularize socialism in Egypt. He was also helped spread the writings of Darwin, Nietzsche and Freud to his countrymen. Moussa played at least complementary role in the development of Egyptian independence. Moussa apparently traveled to London and became a member of the Fabian Society in 1909.

I apologize. For some of these people, I can only find sources on Wikipedia, but I'm going to venture a guess to say this is indeed accurate. This again gives us a clear view of how much of a role the Fabian Society played in national independence movements away from colonialism which was an important step towards the establishment of a world government commonwealth.

"In England, socialism was on the rise as well as ideas of Social Darwinism, and Moussa had a lot of interactions with members of the Fabian Society and became a member in July 1909. Moussa embraced Fabian ideas of getting rid of the landed classes and empowering the peasant, and he wanted to realize them in Egypt."

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salama_Moussa

There's another thing I thought I should mention. Bertrand Russell and his wife Dora Black founded the experimental Beacon Hill School in 1927. The school was run from a succession of different locations, including its original premises at their home, Telegraph House, near Harting, West Sussex. This was an experiment school where the Russells were allowed to test out various methods of educational indoctrination, especially relating to sexuality. During this time, Russell published his book "On Education, Especially in Early Childhood". It seems he was specifically interested in discovering different methods for promoting promiscuity and destroying pair bonding.

According to a news clipping that I found, the students at this school were allowed to bathe and sleep together. They were also permitted to be naked on the premise. No religion was taught at the school. Bertrand Russell left the school in 1932 but Dora continued it until 1943.

Russell wrote the following passage in an article titled, "Education Without Sex Taboos" on November 15, 1927:

"I do not believe in teaching children about the "sacredness" of sex or motherhood or anything else. The right attitude seems to me to be purely scientific: the facts are so and so. Like all other facts, they should not be forced on children, but should be told them when they want to know them. The emotions that we may wish them to feel later on cannot, in any case, be felt before puberty, and should arise spontaneously, not as a result of teaching, since taught emotions are not genuine. I do not deny that emotions can be taught by Dr. Watson's methods; what I am thinking of is the method of moral exhortation."

https://newrepublic.com/article/101508/education-without-sex-taboos

Well said, Anon. I made an entire thread titled that analyzed George Bernard Shaw's book "Fabianism and the Empire". I added some quotations from a few other books that detailed how so-called national independence movements are actually used as a stepping stone towards world government. By joining international governmental organizations like the British Commonwealth or the United Nations, citizens are more likely to few themselves as equal partners of this new world system. They are less likely to revolt than they would be under a more obvious colonial structure. But in reality, this feigned independence is simply the next step towards integrating nations within a world state and eventually removing their national sovereignty entirely.

“Theoretically, they should be internationalized, not British-Imperialized; but until the Federation of the World becomes an accomplished fact, we must accept the most responsible Imperial federations available as a substitute for it.” - Fabianism and the Empire: A Manifesto by the Fabian Society edited by George Bernard Shaw, Page 24

“This conception of the Commonwealth as the nucleus of a system of world government was discussed from various angles, both in the session of that morning and at the two subsequent meetings of the Commission.” - British Commonwealth and the Future: Proceedings of the Second Unofficial Conference on British Commonwealth Relations, Sydney 3rd-17th September, 1938 edited by Henry Vincent Hodson, Page 221

“The Commonwealth order, we may surmise, is only a path to a world order. The Conference discussions suggested that this gradual assimilation might happen in the economic as well as the political sphere. Whether the Commonwealth would then continue, or pass away as having fulfilled its usefulness, would be for some British Commonwealth Relations Conference of the future to discuss.” - British Commonwealth and the Future: Proceedings of the Second Unofficial Conference on British Commonwealth Relations, Sydney 3rd-17th September, 1938 edited by Henry Vincent Hodson, Page 278

Here are a few interesting passages I thought I would add to thread. George Orwell describes the mentality of Fabian Socialists like George Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb in his book “The Road to Wigan Pier”. I think his assessment was very accurate.

The Road to Wigan Pier by George Orwell:

https://archive.org/details/roadtowiganpie00orwe

“Take the plays of a lifelong Socialist like Shaw. How much understanding or even awareness of working-class life do they display? Shaw himself declares that you can only bring a working man on the stage ’as an object of compassion’; in practice he doesn’t bring him on even as that, but merely as a sort of W. W. Jacobs figure of fun—the ready-made comic East Ender, like those in Major Barbara and Captain Brassbound’s Conversion. At best his attitude to the working class is the sniggering Punch attitude, in more serious moments (consider, for instance, the young man who symbolizes the dispossessed classes in Misalliance) he finds them merely contemptible and disgusting. Poverty and, what is more, the habits of mind created by poverty, are something to be abolished from above, by violence if necessary; perhaps even preferably by violence.” The Road to Wigan Pier by George Orwell, Page 211

“You get the same thing in a more mealy-mouthed form in Mrs Sidney Webb’s autobiography, which gives, unconsciously, a most revealing picture of the high-minded Socialist slum-visitor. The truth is that, to many people calling themselves Socialists, revolution does not mean a movement of the masses with which they hope to associate themselves; it means a set of reforms which ’we’, the clever ones, are going to impose upon ’them’, the Lower Orders.” – The Road to Wigan Pier by George Orwell, Pages 211-212

James Ramsay MacDonald, the former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1929 to 1935, was a member of the Fabian Society. He also had five Fabian Socialists within his first Labour cabinet.

“In London, MacDonald became actively involved in two causes which placed moral action at their heart: the socialist Fellowship of the New Life (which gave rise to the Fabian Society), and the burgeoning Ethical movement. In an article for Seedtime, the Fellowship’s journal, MacDonald outlined his central belief: that ‘political change is not desirable for its own sake, but rather for its effect on human well-

being'. The ethical societies, which had – as the London Ethical Society put it – 'well-doing and well-being' as their object, drew those like MacDonald, who sought social reform in the service of human welfare. From the late 1880s, he attended 'services' at the South Place Ethical Society, lectured for the East London Ethical Society, and became ever more involved in this secular striving for a fairer world."

https://heritage.humanists.uk/james-ramsay-macdonald-1866-1937/

"As the electoral significance of the Labour Party grew in the inter-war period, the contribution of the society kept pace. In 1923, over twenty Fabians were elected to parliament, with five Fabians in Ramsay MacDonald's first Labour cabinet. Future prime minister and Fabian Clement Attlee received his first ministerial post at this time."

https://fabians.org.uk/about-us/our-history/

In his autobiography titled "Experiment In Autobiography: Discoveries and Conclusions of a Very Ordingary Brain (since 1866)", H.G. Wells talks about originally attending Fabian Society open meetings at Kelmscott House every Sunday. He wore a red tie to symbolize his commitment to the world socialist revolutionary which indicates his initiation into the Open Conspiracy circles even before he formally joined the Fabian Society.

Experiment In Autobiography: Discoveries and Conclusions of a Very Ordingary Brain (since 1866) by H.G. Wells:

https://archive.org/details/WellsHGExperimentInAutobiography/Wells%2C%20HG%20-%20Experiment%20In%20Autobiography%20Volume%201/

"William Burton, E. H. Smith and I declared ourselves to be out-and-out socialists and signified the same with red ties. The rest of our set came most of the way with us, but with a more temperate enthusiasm. We trailed off to open meetings of the Fabian Society, which reminded me not a little of that Parliament in Landport, and we went on Sunday evenings to Kelmscott House on the Mall, Hammersmith, where William Morris held meetings in a sort of conservatory beside his house. He used to stand up with his back to the wall, with his hands behind him when he spoke, leaning forward as he unfolded each sentence and punctuating with a bump back to position. Graham Wallas, a very good looking young man

then with an academic humour, was muchin evidence, and Shaw, a raw, aggressive Dubliner, was a frequent speaker." - Experiment In Autobiography: Discoveries and Conclusions of a Very Ordingary Brain (since 1866) by H.G. Wells, Pages 238-239